

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 7618. A bill to provide for rehabilitation in civil employment of persons disabled in the active military or naval service during the present war; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DREWRY:

H. R. 7619. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), and "title IV of the Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1941" approved September 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 883); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. R. 7620. A bill to provide for adjusting royalties for the use of inventions for the benefit of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 7621. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 7622. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to readjust the pay and allowance of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service," approved June 10, 1922, as amended by the act approved June 16, 1942 (Public Law 607, 77th Cong.), to fix the annual base pay of female nurses of the Army and Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 7626. A bill to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7623. A bill for the relief of Jacob Wolozin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 7624. A bill for the relief of Jack Acarton alias John Akerton alias Simon Jan Skarzenski; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 7625. A bill for the relief of Michael Kanchler alias Michael Kancir, alias Michael Kuluk; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 7626. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frances Brooks Hydrick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 7627. A bill for the relief of John G. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3341. By Mr. BURGIN: Petition of a group of citizens of Davidson County, N. C., urging the passage of the Sheppard bill (S. 860); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3342. Also, resolution recently adopted by members of the Rotary Club of Star, N. C., favoring the drafting of capital and labor for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3343. By Mr. DONDERO: Petition of the disabled American veterans of Pontiac Chap-

ter, No. 16, Pontiac, Mich., asking that a standard manner of saluting the American flag be enacted for all; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3344. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of Mrs. Howard Floyd and 38 other citizens of Ness County, protesting against the present governmental policy as to liquor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3345. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Los Angeles Newspaper Guild, urging California Congressmen to sign the discharge petition to bring the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill on the floor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3346. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. A. G. Standlee and 76 other citizens of Maypearl, Ellis County, Tex., urging that intoxicating liquor be removed from the camps of the armed forces of our Government in order to make for more efficiency in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3347. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Mrs. John McCosh, secretary, social education and action, Presbyterian Missionary Society of Winfield, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 860 or similar legislation providing for the largest possible protection for the men of our Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3348. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition circulated by Mrs. Beryl B. Ashley, of Adrian, Mich., and signed by 106 other residents of that community, urging the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3349. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the board of directors of Pacific States Livestock Marketing Association, relative to manpower engaged in essential activities in industry and agriculture for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3350. Also, resolution of the Reclamation Board of the State of California, dated August 17, relative to maintenance and patrol of existing and future levees of Sacramento River flood-control project, and the question of provision for maintenance of project works upon completion; to the Committee on Flood Control.

3351. Also, resolution No. 2853 of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, adopted September 11, 1942, petitioning Congress to enact legislation to provide medical care, hospitalization, and compensation for civilian defense workers injured in line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3352. Also, resolution of the San Francisco Labor Council regarding pay raise for postal employees and immediate enactment of Senate bill 2674; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1942

Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, D. D., minister, Washington Hebrew Congregation, offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the shield of our hopes, the tower of strength of our souls, the guide of our hands, the vision of our courage, the love in our hearts: Bless Thou the deliberations of this body, so that freemen will find the leadership for an age of courage and of faith, so that freemen will have strength to go forward and build Thy world of righteousness.

Be Thou with these good men who bear the burden of the conscience of this blessed land. Establish Thou, O God, the labor of their souls, and grant unto

the generations to come an abundant harvest of the seeds the brave hearts of our time are sowing. Guide our country and guard our sons and lead us onward in Thy vision. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, September 30, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—  
APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on September 29, 1942, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2698) to make transportation and storage facilities available for military use where military necessity exists, by authorizing the removal to other points of merchandise in customs custody.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7408) to amend the act of October 9, 1940, entitled "An act to restrict or regulate the delivery of checks drawn against funds of the United States, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, to addresses outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes," in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 346) extending for 2 months the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under the acts of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205), and June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 241), and it was signed by the Vice President.

## PETITION AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CAPPER:

A memorial of sundry citizens of Fort Scott, Kans., remonstrating against the use of sugar in the manufacture of alcoholic beverages; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition, numerously signed, of members of the congregation of Shawnee Community Methodist Church, Shawnee, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquor and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

TAXATION OF STATE, COUNTY, AND  
MUNICIPAL BONDS—PROTEST OF 24  
MISSISSIPPI MAYORS

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I wish to present to the Senate for appropriate reference and publication in the body of the Record a joint telegram signed by 24 mayors of cities of my State protesting against the tax which has been suggested against the income of State, county, and municipal bonds.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JACKSON, MISS., September 28, 1942.  
Senator THEODORE G. BILBO,  
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned members of the executive committee of the Mississippi Municipal Association, desire to protest against the passage of that provision in the new revenue measure now pending which proposes to tax the income on State, county, and municipal bonds. This would automatically increase the cost of all future municipal financing. We are at the present time having to bear unusual and unexpected costs necessitated by civilian defense; are also called upon to pay part of the costs of the Federal food-stamp plan and other Federal agencies. Our municipal incomes are bound to shrink sharply because of reduced inventories in the gasoline, oil, and tire businesses as well as in other businesses. No doubt some of these people will have to retire from business, and we will lose privilege taxes heretofore collected from them. Serious reductions in our municipal income will no doubt necessitate considerable refunding of bonds and the interest rate which we have to pay would certainly be increased if this measure is passed. We respectfully urge you to oppose the passage of the measure on the floor of the Senate.

The names which are signed to this telegram are signed by telegraphic authority conferred upon Mayor W. J. Byrne, the chairman of this committee.

Mayor J. P. Nanney, Tupelo; Mayor L. L. Broyles, Aberdeen; Mayor J. W. Milner, Gulfport; Mayor F. B. Deshon, Water Valley; Mayor C. Patterson, New Albany; Mayor R. E. Williams, Charleston; Mayor Gordon L. Lyon, Indianola; Mayor S. R. Keesler, Greenwood; Mayor J. C. Miller, Laurel; Mayor T. W. Lewis, Jr., Columbus; Mayor Harry J. Landry, Friarpoint; John A. Swanzy, Commissioner, Biloxi; Mayor Geo. Calhoun, Hattiesburg; Mayor T. M. Dye, Clarksdale; Mayor W. E. Howell, Durant; Mayor A. P. Latimer, Shaw; Mayor E. H. Reber, Fayette; Mayor J. A. Maxwell, Drew; Mayor M. Prince, Philadelphia; Mayor W. J. Stockett, Woodville; Mayor L. C. Probst, Grenada; Mayor J. C. Hamilton, Vicksburg; Mayor S. A. Kramer, McComb; Mayor A. E. Wood, Clinton.

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4971) to prohibit the issuance of alcoholic beverage licenses in certain localities in the District of Columbia, to prohibit advertising the price of such beverages, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1628) thereon.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 2815. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to provide for the more equitable determination of quotas and assist in retaining manpower necessary for the production of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2816. A bill to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2817. A bill to permit certain persons charged with or convicted of crimes against the United States to serve in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7408) to amend the act of October 9, 1940, entitled "An act to restrict or regulate the delivery of checks drawn against funds of the United States, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, to addresses outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes," was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### AMENDMENT TO THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7378) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

#### INVESTIGATION OF REQUISITIONING OF RAILROAD PROPERTY

Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. HATCH) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 297), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full investigation of the practices and policies followed by the War Production Board, the Office of Defense Transportation, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, directly or through subsidiary agencies, with respect to the requisitioning or other acquisition of railroad property. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of such investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

#### THE PRESERVATION OF SMALL BUSINESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject The Preservation of Small Business in the War Emergency, delivered by Senator MURRAY on September 29, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE FARM PROBLEM

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD questions propounded by Charles Dana Bennett, representing the National Grange, and a copy of the replies made by Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma, in connection with the radio program on the farm problem at Washington, D. C., Sunday, September 27, 1942, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY LT. GOV. ODELL SHEPARD TO THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Odell Shepard, Lieutenant Governor of Connecticut, in Derby, Conn., September 26, 1942, at the annual banquet of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE FARM SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE WEST

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial written by Frank Motz for the Hays News with respect to the farm situation, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE UNNAMED ALLY—ARTICLE BY LOUIS LIPSKY

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Unnamed Ally of the United States," written by Louis Lipsky, and published in the September issue of the Free World, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE CRISIS IN FARM LABOR

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Keep Skilled Labor on the Farms," published in the October 3 issue of the Prairie Farmer, and an editorial by Ralph Ammon, director of the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. VANDENBERG obtained the floor. Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator think that advisable?

Mr. HILL. I do.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Overton
Andrews	Green	Pepper
Bailey	Gurney	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Herring	Rosier
Eakley	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Schwartz
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Brown	La Follette	Smith
Bunker	Langer	Spencer
Burton	Lee	Stewart
Butler	Lodge	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Tunnell
Chavez	McNary	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Van Nuys
Connally	Mead	Wagner
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Murdoch	Wheeler
Downey	Murray	White
Doxey	Norris	Wiley
Ellender	Nye	Willis
George	O'Daniel	
Gerry	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business in connection with the Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are detained on important public business.



Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. Austin] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. Brewster] is absent on business of the Senate in connection with investigation of the Truman committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

#### SOCIAL-SECURITY PAY-ROLL TAXES

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to discuss briefly a press statement made 2 days ago by the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., at his press conference, regarding the action of the Senate Finance Committee in voting to freeze social-security pay-roll taxes at present levels for the year 1943. I feel a special responsibility in this matter, because the action of the Finance Committee was on my motion; and the new title added to the tax bill is the text of Senate bill 2781, which I introduced in the Senate on September 17, 1942.

I dislike to sharply disagree with Secretary Morgenthau in any aspect of the tremendously perplexing burdens which he carries as he faces the well-nigh imponderable task of finding the funds to pay our enormous war bills. I have a deep respect for his earnestness and for his personal and public integrity, and I am happy to add that we are warm personal friends. Furthermore, I freely concede that no one may safely be dogmatic in dealing with all the speculative arithmetic which is necessarily involved in calculations under the social-security law. But in the present instance it seems to me so clear that the Secretary's recent statement is in violent conflict with the facts and so likely to lead to totally unfounded conclusions, and to mislead not only public opinion but also congressional decisions regarding this vitally important matter, that I wish to explore the problem promptly and without further delay. I should have spoken sooner except that I did not want to interrupt or delay the debate on the latest version of the so-called anti-inflation bill.

Mr. President, in presenting this subject let me go back for a moment to the background. Congress substantially rewrote the Social Security Act in 1939 as the result of an impartial, independent study which was made by an advisory commission created under the authority of the Senate Finance Committee. The great issue at that time between the Social Security Act as originally written and the Social Security Act as it came into operation in the 4 subsequent years up to 1939, the great fundamental question was whether the social-security law should operate on a so-called full reserve basis.

Senators may remember the discussions which used to rotate around the enormous \$47,000,000,000 trust fund reserve contemplated by 1980, which dramatizes the thing about which I am talking, namely whether governmental, tax-

supported old-age insurance had to be built on a full reserve basis, precisely as though it were being administered by private insurance companies and sustained on the basis of actuarial calculations necessary in the operation of private companies.

In 1939 Congress decided that the full reserve should be abandoned. It abandoned the full reserve with the ultimate acquiescence of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau. Instead, a contingent reserve basis was initiated, and the system was put substantially on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Thereupon, in 1939 a schedule of pay-roll taxes for old-age benefits against employers and employees was established for the subsequent 10 or 12 years. Under that schedule, at the present time employers are paying 1 percent upon pay rolls and employees are paying 1 percent upon pay rolls. Under the existing statute, unless amended prior to New Year's, these pay roll taxes increase 100 percent; they become 2 percent on employers and 2 percent on employees on January 1, 1943.

One week ago today the Senate Finance Committee, by a vote of 12 to 4, concluded that pay-roll taxes upon both employers and employees should be frozen at the existing 1-percent level for the year 1943. In other words, in the face of all the other stupendous tax burdens which are accumulating in the new tax bill, it was deemed proper, wise, prudent, and equitable, in the face of indisputable facts justifying such action, that the employers and their 40,000,000 pay-roll workers in this country should be saved a 100-percent increase in their social-security taxes in 1943.

That action was promptly condemned by the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury in his statement at his press conference on Monday, September 28. I read from the report of the press conference in the Washington Times-Herald of Tuesday, September 29:

In his attack—

That is the attack of the Secretary—

on the Vandenberg amendment, issued at his press conference yesterday, Morgenthau said the passage of the amendment "would jeopardize the program for financing old-age and survivors' insurance."

I further quote:

"Sound financing requires the social-security contributions be collected at the scheduled levels, especially during a period of very high incomes and employment such as this," Mr. Morgenthau continued.

Mr. President, this is a straight-out charge that the action of the Senate Finance Committee, by a vote of 12 to 4, in freezing pay-roll taxes at existing 1 percent levels for 1943, is a threat to the solvency of the social-security trust dedication.

Whatever else may be involved in the controversy—and I shall come to some of the other phases of it a little later—I deny upon the basis of the facts as I shall present them, and upon the basis of Mr. Morgenthau's own calculations, that there is one scintilla of justification for

even remotely suggesting that the action of the Senate Finance Committee, in freezing these pay-roll taxes at existing levels in 1943, jeopardized in any degree whatsoever the integrity of the social-security fund, and I shall undertake to prove my assertion beyond any possibility of contradiction.

Mr. President, there are only two purposes for which pay-roll taxes under the Social Security Act, in respect to old-age pensions, may appropriately be used within a reasonable recognition of the trust character of the funds themselves. One is for the payment of current benefits and administrative expenses, and the other is to accumulate essential contingent reserves. Now let us test the existing situation in respect to these two legitimate uses of social-security pay-roll taxes. Is there any need for an increase in these taxes January 1, 1943, to pay current benefits in 1943? Let us look at the record.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, the receipts from social-security taxes amounted to \$972,000,000. That sum was collected at the 1 percent rate. Against such collections the total withdrawals, or payments, were only \$141,000,000.

If that was the relationship in 1942 it is inevitably the relationship in 1943, because the collections are larger on account of the general employment which the country enjoys, and the benefit payments will be at the lowest possible estimate, because of the disappearance almost of unemployment from the American economy. Indeed, the pay-roll-tax collection, if continued at 1 percent in 1943, will produce as much as was originally estimated to be produced from a 2-percent tax in 1943. Certainly so long as only \$141,000,000 is needed to meet obligations, and anything like \$972,000,000 is being collected, there can be by no stretch of the imagination any remote argument that an increase in these pay-roll taxes is necessary to meet current obligations and administrative expenses.

All right. That clears itself away, it seems to me, beyond any chance of controversy whatever, and leaves the only possible argument at the point of the necessary and appropriate reserve—the same old argument that we had in 1939, and which was substantially settled by Congress itself in 1939.

Now let us see what the reserve ought to be, Mr. President, because we have got to find that figure before we can determine whether the existing revenues are adequate. What should the reserve be? I will call Mr. Morgenthau himself as my witness as to what the reserve ought to be. Mr. Morgenthau, testifying on March 24, 1939, before the House Ways and Means Committee, when this matter was settled and liquidated by Congress itself, said:

We should not accumulate a reserve fund any larger than is necessary to protect the system against unforeseen declines in revenues or increases in the volume of benefit payments. Specifically—

Mr. Morgenthau speaking—

Specifically, I would suggest to Congress that it plan the financing of the old-age-insurance system with a view to maintaining for use in contingencies an eventual reserve amounting to—

These are the critical, significant words—

amounting to not more than three times the highest prospective annual benefits in the ensuing 5 years.

That is Mr. Morgenthau's definition of the essential reserve which should be created behind social-security pay rolls. He added a suggestion that the reserve might be a little larger in the initial years, but this is his fundamental formula, and I ask Senators to bear it in mind as we proceed. The Secretary of the Treasury's formula in respect to social-security pay-roll reserve is that the reserve is adequate when it is three times the prospective benefit payments during the 5 subsequent years.

Congress in 1939 did precisely what the Secretary recommended. While it did not in terms write this formula as a directive in the law, it did write a provision in title II of the Social Security Act to create a board of trustees of the Federal Old Age and Survivors Trust Fund, and among other things the board is required—and I quote from the statute—

to report immediately to the Congress whenever the board of trustees is of the opinion—

What opinion?

that during the ensuing 5 fiscal years the trust fund will exceed three times the highest annual expenditures anticipated during that 5-fiscal-year period.

So, Mr. President, in testing the validity of Mr. Morgenthau's amazing statement at his press conference last Monday, it must be tested against his own rule and against the action of the Congress itself in asserting that the appropriate reserve, the only reserve necessary, is a reserve which equals three times the anticipated benefit payments during the 5 subsequent years.

All right. Now, let us see where we stand under that rule. The assets of the trust fund, which is to say the reserve, were \$3,227,000,000 at the end of the fiscal year 1942.

The reserve is not merely 3 times the anticipated benefit payments during the 5 subsequent years; the reserve is not only already 3 times the amount set up by Mr. Morgenthau in his own testimony as the essential test of the integrity of the reserve funds; it is not only 3 times what it ought to be—it is 30 times what is required in any 1 of these subsequent 5 fiscal years, and it is 6 times the total requirements of the next 5 fiscal years.

There just cannot be any denial of those figures. The trust fund today is twice as big as Mr. Morgenthau has said is its maximum necessity. Yet when the Senate Finance Committee proposes to maintain a tax collection at existing bases instead of adding 100 percent to the pay-roll-tax burden of 40,000,000 workers in this country and all their employers, in spite of the fact that the trust fund at

this moment is 100 percent better off than Mr. Morgenthau himself said it needed to be, Mr. Morgenthau has the—I almost used the word "effrontery"—to say this proposal jeopardizes the program for financing old-age and survivors insurance, and that it violates sound financing. I submit that he is magnificently wrong.

Mr. President, let us go to an even better source of information. Let us go to Dr. A. J. Altmeyer, Chairman of the Federal Security Agency of the Social Security Board. Dr. Altmeyer has been the administrator of this law ever since it was initiated. He is a very able administrator. I sent him a questionnaire about 4 weeks ago, and I submitted certain specific questions to him. I want to read one of his answers bearing squarely upon the question of whether Mr. Morgenthau was entitled to make this frontal attack upon an action by the Senate Finance Committee by a vote of 12 to 4.

Question to Dr. Altmeyer from me:

What pay-roll tax, on employer and employee, is necessary in 1943 in order to maintain a "reserve" which is "three times the highest annual expenditure expected in the next 5-year fiscal period"?

That is the question I am discussing at the moment before the Senate. What is Dr. Altmeyer's answer—the answer of the chief administrator of this law? This is contained in a letter under date of September 2, 1942, and Dr. Altmeyer speaking:

With continuance of the conditions assumed in table 3 of the trustees' report—

And that is the normal contemplation of what is about to happen economically under the Social Security Act in 1943—

If no taxes whatever—

Says Dr. Altmeyer—

If no taxes whatever were collected in the fiscal year 1943, the trust fund at the end of the year would be about \$3,100,000,000, which would still be more than three times the highest annual anticipated expenditure during the next 5 fiscal years.

In other words, Mr. President, when Mr. Morgenthau's own rule is applied to the net result of the action of the Senate Finance Committee, instead of producing a situation endangering the integrity of the social-security trust fund, it appears that if no taxes at all were collected in 1943, still the trust fund would measure fully to the Secretary's own specifications in respect to its integrity. Yet the Secretary of the Treasury says we are about to jeopardize the social-security fund by keeping pay-roll taxes where they are for another year.

What are these projected benefit payments in the next 5 years? Again I am quoting Dr. Altmeyer:

A simple projection of the expenditure figures in table 3 of the trustees' report would result in an estimate of about \$465,000,000 in benefit payments and administrative expenses for the fiscal year 1947. With this projection, three times the highest annual expenditure during the 5 years beginning in 1943 would be approximately \$1,400,000,000.

That is the sum total of the requirement under Mr. Morgenthau's own pro-

nounced rule as to the necessities of this reserve fund—\$1,400,000,000. According to Dr. Altmeyer you will have in excess of \$3,000,000,000 in the fund. Yet the Secretary says that this action of the Senate Finance Committee in postponing for 12 months the 100-percent increase in the burden upon 40,000,000 workers in this country and their employers is a threat to the integrity of the fund.

Continuing Dr. Altmeyer says:

If retirement of present potential beneficiaries is assumed, however, annual expenditures in 1947 would amount to approximately \$765,000,000.

In other words, he is making a new calculation and carrying it to the utmost extreme of the challenge which this trust fund could possibly meet.

Under such an assumption, three times the highest annual expenditures during the 5 years after 1942 would be \$2,300,000,000.

In other words, even though the benefit payments and the administrative expenses under the old-age pension section of the social-security law be figured at the maximum possibility of drain, the reserve fund today, without another penny in it, is 50 percent bigger than it needs to be under Mr. Morgenthau's own specifications; yet Mr. Morgenthau undertakes to say to the Congress and to the country that the action of the Senate Finance Committee threatens the validity and integrity of the trust fund. I deny it vehemently. I deny it on the basis of every available fact. I deny the justification for any such propaganda.

I do not want to leave any misunderstanding about Dr. Altmeyer. Dr. Altmeyer is opposed to the action of the Senate Finance Committee in freezing the pay-roll taxes for 1943. I suppose that is perfectly natural.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. Did any representatives of the agency which deals with this question appear before the Finance Committee in reference to the amendment offered by the Senator?

Mr. VANDENBERG. They did not.

Mr. WAGNER. Then there were no hearings at all?

Mr. VANDENBERG. None were necessary. The statement of the facts was so conclusive that the committee did not require any additional testimony.

Referring to Dr. Altmeyer—because I have such profound respect for him that I would not leave any semblance of misunderstanding with regard to him—he wants the increased pay-roll taxes to come in precisely as originally scheduled. He probably has a sound theoretical reason for it, although I confess I have been totally unable to discover it in his answer to my questionnaire. However, I never knew of the head of any administrative agency in this Government agreeing that his revenues ought to be reduced. That would be a "nature fake."

This raises the question, Why did Mr. Morgenthau make this statement? I have been extremely critical of him, perhaps, in respect of his arithmetic up to



date. I sympathize with what I know is the reason for making the statement which he made. He himself confesses it in the final portion of his interview. This is what he says:

Passage of the Vandenberg amendment would also require substantial adjustment in the Government's plans for war financing. It would, in effect, reduce the flow of anti-inflationary funds into the Treasury—

Not into the social-security fund, but into the Treasury—

by over \$1,500,000,000.

The administration's record on social security has been clear and consistent. Last January the President submitted a budget based on the assumption that the scheduled rate increases in social-security contributions would go into effect on January 1, 1943, and that in addition \$2,000,000,000 in new contributions would be raised for an expanded social-security program.

There you are, Mr. President. What the Secretary of the Treasury wants to do is precisely what he wanted to do with the social-security funds in 1935, when the system started, and precisely the thing which he was denied by the action of Congress in 1939. He wants to use the flow of presently unnecessary reserve funds as a reservoir into which he can pour a comparable part of his War bonds.

Mr. President, that is an objective with which it is exceedingly difficult to quarrel. Certainly I have total sympathy with the Secretary in the tremendous task which he confronts in finding the funds to pay our enormous war bills, but I submit that if there must be an enforced draft upon the resources of this country to pay our war bills, it should be done in the open.

It should be done frankly and honestly in the name of the war effort. It should apply equally to everybody. It should not approach in disguise the Social Security reserve funds, and it should not be applied exclusively to the workers on our industrial pay rolls and their employers. I do not believe that the trust fund of the social-security law should be used, even in a collateral fashion, for anything whatsoever except social-security benefits.

We confront a tremendous problem in respect to the necessity for finding adequate funds to meet our war bills. This little device would be only a drop in the bucket, even from a practical standpoint. When we shall have finished with our tax bill, if we shall have succeeded in raising, let us say, \$3,000,000,000 more, the total revenues of the Government for the present fiscal year will be about \$25,000,000,000. The expenditures will be, in round numbers, \$75,000,000,000. The difference is \$50,000,000,000. The voluntary bond purchase plan of the Treasury never has been anticipated to produce more than \$12,000,000,000, and it is not doing that. If we take \$12,000,000,000 from \$50,000,000,000 we have \$38,000,000,000 left. If we allocate, say, \$8,000,000,000 of the balance to normal purchases by insurance companies and other purchasers we still have \$30,000,000,000 in this fiscal year for which there is absolutely no provision, either by way of taxes or by way of a program of safe

and prudent borrowing. The budget for the following fiscal year is already fixed at \$90,000,000,000.

When we face these enormous figures in respect to the deficit which must be financed by the Treasury, I submit that some better plan is necessary than a camouflaged assault upon the trust funds of the social-security system—to get what? To get \$1,000,000,000 in 1943. I repeat, it is only a drop in the bucket, even if it be considered from a practical point of view. There must be a better plan than that. The Secretary, instead of thinking up press propaganda of this nature, had better be considering an all-out program adequate to meet his all-out responsibility.

However, entirely aside from the practical point of view, I submit as a moral proposition that there is utterly no justification for increasing the pay-roll taxes under the Social Security Act for anything except social-security purposes; and if, in order to pay our war bills, the pay rolls of the country must be taxed, in addition to everything else we are doing, the tax must fall equally on every citizen of this country, and not merely on the prospective beneficiaries of the social-security system.

Mr. President, there is only one other consideration involved. There are pending substantial proposals for the expansion of social-security coverage, and for what I believe to be a merited increase in social-security benefit payments in many categories. Whenever Congress gets around to take that action there will be no resistance from me to gearing social-security pay-roll taxes to whatever level is necessary to pay for social-security benefits; but there is no prospect of such action by Congress, certainly within 6 months. We are moving into 1943, when automatically these taxes will increase on January 1. I submit that if they are increased on January 1 for other than social-security benefits, it will be distinctly difficult subsequently to divert them back to social-security purposes if and when the social-security law itself is expanded. I submit that the freezing of these taxes at 1 percent on next January 1 would be directly helpful to the ultimate project of expansion of the coverage of the law itself, and the creation of adequate new benefits under it.

In conclusion, I submit that the statement made by the Secretary of the Treasury is without justification in respect to its charge that there is anything in the action of the Senate Finance Committee which threatens the integrity of the reserve fund. Secondly, I submit that in the latter part of his statement he is going far afield and dealing "too little and too late" with a tremendous red-ink deficit when he leans upon a diversion of the ultimate use of these funds for the purpose of meeting war deficits.

I must not leave that statement without explanation. There is nothing illegal, illegitimate, or immoral about the way in which these trust funds operate when they reach the Social Security Board. They must be invested in Government bonds. Obviously the funds themselves flow into the general reser-

voir of the Government. That is all within the contemplation of the law. I am not complaining upon that score, except as these pay-roll taxes are consciously padded for these collateral purposes; but I am complaining that the chief fiscal agent of the Government should give the country to understand that there is a threat to the integrity of the greatest trust fund in the world in an action by the Senate Finance Committee which merely takes his own rule, applies it to the existing reserves, and finds the existing reserves under the Social Security Act twice as competent as he himself has said they need to be.

Mr. President, I submit that the action of the Senate Finance Committee should stand and that these pay-roll taxes should be frozen at present levels for 1943; and I submit that the Secretary of the Treasury should be a little more accurate in the statements he makes to the American people upon this subject.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, as the sponsor of the original social-security law, I have naturally been interested in its enforcement and success. I oppose the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], but this is not the time to make an address regarding it, and I do not propose to do so. I hope that when the tax bill shall be before the Senate I may have an opportunity to discuss the provisions of the amendment at some length.

I deeply regret that an amendment so serious, affecting the security of 50,000,000 workers, should have been adopted in the committee without hearings of any kind.

In response to my request for information bearing upon the issue, the Chairman of the Social Security Board has transmitted copy of a letter sent to the Senator from Michigan setting forth much of the pertinent data.

The Senate and the country will be greatly interested to know that our national organizations, far from seeking reductions in pay-roll taxes for social-security purposes, have written me opposing the Vandenberg amendment and strongly urging a further increase in taxes with a corresponding increase in insurance protection.

I offer the communications to which I have referred for the RECORD, to be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,  
SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD,  
Washington, D. C., September 29, 1942.  
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: In answer to your request for material bearing upon the question of the old-age and survivors insurance tax increase, I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I sent to Senator VANDENBERG in answer to a similar request which I received from him some time ago.

If there is any further information you desire, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. ALTMAYER,  
Chairman.

SEPTEMBER 2, 1942.

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: This is in reply to your letter of August 18, in which you raise several questions relating to contribution rates under the old-age and survivors insurance program and the size of the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund. I note that you address yourself to the issue of whether the contribution rates scheduled in the law are necessary to the functioning of the system as it now stands, and that you wish to exclude for the time being any reference to a broadened system or to the use of the funds in financing the war. I am pleased to have the opportunity to discuss these questions with you, and am answering your specific questions in order below and in accordance with your numbering.

"(1) The Senate Finance Committee report in 1939 emphasized, as did the bill itself, that the maximum 'reserve' required was 'three times the highest annual expenditures expected in the next 5-fiscal-year period.' Is it not a fact that your board's report for this year shows that the fund today exceeds thirty times the highest annual benefits of the next 5 years?"

With regard to the first sentence of your question neither the Senate Finance Committee report in 1939 nor the Social Security Act amendments of that year indicate that the maximum reserve required is three times the highest annual expenditures expected in the next 5-fiscal-year period. The amended law provides only that a report be made to Congress whenever the board of trustees anticipates that the trust fund will exceed three times the highest annual expenditures anticipated during the ensuing 5 fiscal years.

The Senate Finance Committee report contained no definite statement of policy concerning the size of the reserve required but implied acceptance of a recommendation on the subject by the Secretary of the Treasury. Estimates of the size of the reserve in various years are presented on page 17 of the report, and in the discussion of these estimates it is noted that the reserve shown "will conform closely to the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury of an 'eventual reserve amounting to not more than three times the highest prospective annual benefits in the ensuing 5 years.'" The Secretary's recommendation is stated in terms of an eventual reserve. His testimony emphasized the possibility that—

"We may have for a few years . . . a reserve fund somewhat larger than would be necessary under the standard I have here suggested. However, the early annual disbursements of benefits are neither representative nor can their amount be precisely forecast at this time. Consequently, it may be desirable to anticipate a somewhat larger contingency reserve during the first few years of benefit payments." (Hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee on the Social Security Act Amendments of 1939; vol. 3, pp. 2113-2114.)

Aside from the testimony and recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury, the only other discussion I know of concerning the size of the reserve is to be found in the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee of Prof. J. Douglas Brown. Professor Brown appeared in his capacity as chairman of the Advisory Council on Social Security, which was organized as a result of your interest in questions of social-security financing. Clearly brought out in Professor Brown's testimony was the thought that the three-times standard which he proposed was to be taken only as a rough rule of thumb which might well be disregarded in the early years. Professor Brown suggested:

"Something like roughly three times the benefit load, varying above or below 'the bene-

fit load, but particularly higher in the early years when you are uncertain as to your data." (Hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee on the Social Security Act amendments of 1939; vol. 2, p. 1272.)

With regard to the second sentence in your first question, the highest annual expenditure figure shown in the second annual report of the board of trustees of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund during the 5-year fiscal period covered by table 3 of that report is \$392,000,000. The same table shows the amount of the trust fund at the beginning of that 5-year period as \$2,398,000,000. On the basis of these figures, the trust fund would not exceed 30 times the amount of the highest anticipated annual expenditures in the ensuing 5-year period, but would be only slightly over 6 times that amount. The heading of the table, however, points out that these figures are subject to the limitations stated in the accompanying text. The last two paragraphs of the text on page 5 call attention to the large number of potential claimants for old-age benefits. If these potential beneficiaries all retired from active work by July 1945, an increase in the annual rate of benefit payments of approximately \$300,000,000 would result. If these \$300,000,000 were added to the estimated disbursements shown for 1946 in table 3, the fund at the beginning of 1942 would then be less than 3½ times the highest anticipated annual expenditure during the 5-year period.

Due to the return of many aged individuals to work under covered employment because of the emergency, the potential increase will probably be even larger than that quoted on page 5.

"(2) While the Senate Finance Committee report in 1939 estimated revenues for 1940 under the 1-percent tax at \$501,000,000, and for 1941 at \$505,000,000, have not the actual revenues been \$637,000,000 and \$789,000,000, or, respectively, 127 percent and 156 percent of the estimates?"

The revenue estimates in the committee report were for net tax receipts, i. e., gross receipts minus administrative expenses, and not for total collections. To make the actual collection figures, which you have correctly cited, more nearly comparable with the estimates, it is necessary to deduct allotments for administrative expenses from the former. The actual net receipt figures comparable to the estimates in the committee report were \$611,000,000 in 1940 and \$763,000,000 in 1941.

"(3) In the meantime, have not the benefit payments been only 30 percent of the committee estimates in 1939?"

The estimates of benefit payments in the committee report were \$114,000,000 for 1940 and \$298,000,000 for 1941. Actually benefit payments were \$35,000,000 and \$88,000,000, respectively, in these years, or approximately 30 percent of the estimates in each case.

In large measure the tax receipts and benefit payments in items (2) and (3) above are direct effects of present economic conditions. The combined influence of the increase in tax receipts and the decrease in benefit payments in the last 2 years has been a substantial increase in the trust fund above the estimates. With a decline in economic activity, tax receipts will decrease while benefit payments will increase at a more rapid rate than that indicated by table 3 of the trustees' report. The combined effect of such a trend of events would be a rapid absorption of any excess amounts that will have accumulated in the trust fund.

"(4) In 1939 the committee reported that the old-age reserve fund would increase until 1955, when it would level off at \$6,871,000,000. Does not the annual report of your own board of trustees indicate that the fund will grow to almost \$12,000,000,000 before it levels off, and that this figure will be reached, not in 1955 but in 1946?"

The 1939 committee report estimated that there would be \$6,871,000,000 in the trust fund at the end of 1955. The trustees' report indicates in table 3 that there will be \$10,813,000,000 in the trust fund at the end of the fiscal year 1946. In neither report, however, is there indicated a "leveling off" of the trust fund.

Moreover, the quotation of low and high estimates in the trustees' report on page 8 indicates a recognition of a possible wide range in costs and the reserves. Continuation of the trend shown in table 6 of the committee report would result in decreases in the trust fund during the years after 1955, since benefit payments are increasing in that table more rapidly than net tax receipts plus interest. The table implies, therefore, that revenue additional to that from a 6-percent pay-roll tax may be required to pay benefits and to maintain a small reserve against contingencies; this problem is discussed in the text accompanying this table. Table 3 of the trustees' report indicates that the trust fund would continue to increase for a time after 1946 since its receipts in that year are substantially in excess of total disbursements. Only if we can assume full maintenance of the present high level of employment whether from war activity or other stimulus into the indefinite future, and continuance of the present low retirement rate among older workers, however, will the fund continue to increase for many years at the current rate. Such an assumption would seem to be too uncertain to be used as a basis in planning the wise and safe functioning of the existing system of benefits.

"(5) What pay-roll tax, on employer and employee, is necessary in 1943 in order to maintain a 'reserve' which is 'three times the highest annual expenditure expected in the next 5-fiscal-year period'?"

With continuance of the conditions assumed in table 3 of the trustees' report, if no taxes whatever were collected in the fiscal year 1943, the trust fund at the end of the year would be about \$3,100,000,000, which would still be more than three times the highest annual anticipated expenditure during the next 5 fiscal years.

"(6) What is the present reserve? What is 'three times the highest annual expenditure expected in the next 5-year period'?"

The assets of the trust fund at the end of the fiscal year 1942 were \$3,227,000,000.

The answer to the second sentence of your question requires an estimate of expected annual disbursements in 1947. Such an estimate will not become available until the third board of trustees' report is prepared in conference with the other two members of that board. Because of the rapid changes now occurring in economic conditions, employment levels, acquisition of wage credits by persons nearing 65, wage rates, average age of retirement, etc., preparation of the estimates going into the trustees' report to be submitted to Congress on January 1, 1943, has been postponed to the latest possible date.

A simple projection of the expenditure figures in table 3 of the trustees' report, however, would result in an estimate of about \$465,000,000 in benefit payments and administrative expenses for the fiscal year 1947. With this projection, three times the highest annual expenditure during the 5 years beginning in 1943 would be approximately \$1,400,000,000. If retirement of present potential beneficiaries is assumed, however, annual expenditures in 1947 would amount to approximately \$765,000,000. Under such an assumption, three times the highest annual expenditures during the 5 years after 1942 would be \$2,300,000,000.

Reference has been made to the uncertainty of the data on which all of the estimates for the early years are necessarily based. Of even greater significance in weighing the



questions you have raised are the considerations which were stated in the second annual report of the board of trustees. One of these considerations is that the present high level of pay rolls and of contribution income may decline sharply in the period following termination of the war. Together with such decline, it may reasonably be expected that there will be a substantial increase in the number of eligible persons who retire and go on the benefit rolls. The present demand for labor is enabling many more persons to build up eligibility for benefits than would normally be the case. The report points out that if a material reduction in employment should develop before the end of the 5-year period under discussion, the level of benefit disbursements may be considerably higher, and the level of tax collections considerably lower, than the prospective levels indicated in the table which is included in the report. Prudent management would seem to require that full weight be given to these possibilities.

Another consideration referred to in the trustees' report is that the trend of benefit payment will be a steeply ascending one over the next generation or longer. When this fact is taken into account, it becomes clear that the excess in the reserve in terms of the immediately prospective level of disbursements is very small in comparison with the level of payments to be expected two or three decades hence.

It always has been my understanding that the intent of Congress in enacting the schedule of contribution rates in 1935, an intent not modified in 1939, was that the full rate necessary for the support of the program be applied gradually so that industry and employees would not be burdened by large increases at any one time. This intent is of particular significance for the present question, since postponement of the 1943 increase would in all probability necessitate a sharp increase a few years hence. The necessity for this increase would most probably occur at a time when economic activity slackens and it would be awkward to impose a sudden and large increase in taxes on employees and employers.

Congressional action in postponing the statutory tax increase in 1940 was, I believe, in part a measure to build up purchasing power needed to encourage business activity. To the extent that this was an influence in the decision made in 1939, the present need indicates the desirability of an increase in taxes.

For your information I am enclosing a copy of the second annual report of the board of trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund. If I can be of any further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. ALTMAYER,  
Chairman.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,  
Washington, D. C., October 1, 1942.

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The Vandenberg amendment to H. R. 7378, adopted by the Senate Finance Committee, which proposes to freeze the rate of contribution by employers and employees to old-age and survivors insurance at 1 percent instead of permitting that rate to increase to 2 percent as provided in the Social Security Act, would seriously retard the development of old-age insurance upon which wage earners depend for income to make them independent in old age. This insurance system is new and has not yet met the test of normal benefit payments. Workers are making their contributions equally with employers with the expectation that an actu-

arially sound system will assure them security in old age. The American Federation of Labor believes this proposal to weaken old-age and survivors insurance is unnecessary and unwise from the standpoint of social insurance as well as from that of fiscal needs of the Government and its inflation-control program.

Any such basic decision on social insurance should be reached only after adequate consideration of evidence and hearings for those concerned. The Administration has advised that after passage of the tax bill it will submit proposals to increase the contribution rate for social security to 5 percent.

The American Federation of Labor is urging expansion of our social-insurance system with increased contributions as provided in H. R. 7534, now before the House Ways and Means Committee. In this time of high employment and high national income we ought to lay aside for future emergencies and invest these savings in Federal bonds to finance the war.

We know that unemployment after this war will be more than that following any previous war or any previous depression.

I urge you to vote against the clause which would freeze old-age and survivors contribution rate at 1 percent and the 5-percent payroll victory tax in order that a broad social-security program may be substituted which will permanently benefit wage earners and the whole Nation.

Sincerely yours,

WM. GREEN,  
President, American Federation of Labor.

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL  
ORGANIZATIONS,

Washington, D. C., October 1, 1942.

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: I understand that the present tax bill pending before the Senate Finance Committee contains an amendment submitted by Senator VANDENBERG and approved by your committee which would freeze the present social-security tax at 1 percent. In effect this amendment repeals the present law pursuant to which the social-security tax would be increased as of January 1, 1943, to 2 percent to be paid by both the employer and the employee.

Over and above this there is incorporated in the tax bill pending before your committee a so-called victory tax of 5 percent on all gross income over some very small amount.

It is the considered judgment of the Congress of Industrial Organizations that these two items endanger the present social-security program and eliminate any chance of extending the social-security program in accordance with the several recommendations that have been made by the President of the United States to Congress. Insofar as the so-called victory tax is concerned, the Congress of Industrial Organizations has of course indicated its public position as being opposed to this tax for other equally important reasons.

In England, for instance, during the war, the social-security program has been extended and broadened. It was recognized at an early date in that country that as part of the war program it is essential to afford greater protection to the workers in relation to those matters covered by social security. It would be most unfortunate if in this country we would follow precisely an opposite path.

The workers of this Nation appreciate the fact that many sacrifices will have to be made in the all-out effort for winning the war. They are not merely ready but only too anxious to make these sacrifices.

Social security, however, is the one field where we should bend every effort toward extending and broadening the benefits which

the workers would enjoy under such a program. This is an essential part of the war program.

I therefore believe it is most unfortunate that the two items to which I have referred above are now incorporated in the present tax bill. On behalf of the Congress of Industrial Organizations I wish to express our very definite opposition to both of these items. It is our recommendation that both be eliminated from the tax bill and instead a real investigation be made into the question of how the social-security program, with appropriate tax features, can be extended and broadened consistent with the recommendations of the President of the United States.

I do hope that we can secure your assistance to accomplish the foregoing objectives.

Very truly yours,

PHILIP MURRAY,  
President.

#### ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand that the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is about to address the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of his remarks the Senate proceed to consider measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning at the end of the last call.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I did not understand the Senator's statement of the proposed agreement relative to the call of the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I asked unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] the calendar be called.

Mr. CONNALLY. Immediately at the conclusion of the remarks of the junior Senator from New York?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. Of course, that would not prevent any Senator from making a speech.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wanted to say a few words.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am merely desirous of having the order entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the calendar will be called following the conclusion of the address by the Senator from New York.

#### RELATIONS WITH VICHY FRANCE

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I favor the adoption of a stern policy by the United States toward the Vichy regime in France and the acknowledgment by us of the true status of the French puppet government. I favor the adoption of all means, within practicability, to occupy all the French possessions in the American sphere of civilization.

Mr. President, in the newspapers of today and yesterday we read the story of the seizure on the part of the French Government of hundreds of American citizens. During the last week and hundreds of American citizens were rounded up in occupied France by French police, and were turned over to German occupation authorities, who, in turn, interned some of them in the zoo at Paris. At least 250 Americans were reported held at Paris, alone—250 Americans, regardless of age, sex, or occupation.

Mr. President, I wish to advert for a short time to the present state of our relations with France. A valiant effort has been made by our Government to maintain the slim ties of our once strong bonds of friendship with the French

Government; but it appears that the breaking point may be fast approaching.

Under the treacherous leadership of Pierre Laval, the arch depraver, occupied France is following, step by step, the pattern of the Nazi state. The world has come to know those brave people of France who have refused to collaborate with Hitler as the Free French. They may well be proud of this characterization as "free," because the collaborators in France—Laval and his followers—are truly slaves. They are slaves to the dictates of Hitler. They are making slaves of the people of France.

Two recent political moves directed by Laval have shocked the sensibilities of a world which has become hardened to ordinary unmoral and inhuman acts. I refer to the mass deportation of Jews and to the exchange of war prisoners for labor. These two moves are interwoven. Reliable information tells us that the deportation of the Jews is an act of appeasement, because France did not live up to the expectations of Hitler in the number of men furnished in the exchange of labor for war prisoners.

It is difficult for the American mind to visualize the implications involved in the labor-prisoner exchange between the two puppet states. The tricolor of France has been revered by the American people, and the martial strains of the Marseillaise have always aroused an emotion in the hearts of Americans second only to the music of our own national anthem. Lafayette helped us to gain our freedom. In Flanders Field the French poilu sleeps alongside the American doughboy, brothers in the defense of liberty in the last World War.

The French soldier went to the defense of France when her soil was invaded once again by the Nazi war machine in this second World War. With a suddenness that left the world amazed, France capitulated, surrendered many thousands of troops, and entered into a written truce with her Nazi invaders. It is under this truce that we have the paradoxical situation of two nations acting under a so-called mutual-assistance pact, yet the soldiers of one nation are prisoners of the other. These very prisoners of war, the Frenchmen who risked their lives in the defense of freedom and of liberty, are being released from their prison camps in the ratio of one prisoner for every three workingmen, who, in turn, will be placed in servitude under the Nazi war machine. These workingmen are being fed by Laval to the munitions industry of Nazi Germany, to fashion planes, guns, and tanks, to be used against our armed forces, and to destroy liberty and freedom on the earth. The published photographs of this prisoner-labor exchange in Vichy France are graphic witnesses of this story of the depravity of the Laval regime.

The other jolt to our rising indignation at the extremes to which Laval is going to curry the favor of Hitler was the mass deportation of Jews. The acts of cruelty in this latest scheme of the collaborators are the match of any devised by Hitler since he started to preach and practice anti-Semitism. Innocent, defenseless children are taken from their

parents—are not even left with them in their exile. Families were torn asunder, and members sent to different destinations.

What is the destination of these victims of the Nazi doctrine of hate? They are being sent from a country where they are not wanted to a country whose aim is to destroy and exterminate them from the face of the earth. These unfortunate Jews are headed for forced labor in Nazi Germany, imprisonment, and death.

Political leaders of neutral nations have condemned this outrage. Leading Protestant and Catholic clergymen the world over, even in occupied, subjugated countries, have denounced this inhuman scheme.

The newspaper accounts which have reached this country reveal that His Holiness Pope Pius XII and the Catholic clergy of France have entered strong protests against the inhuman acts of Laval in these wholesale deportations of Jews from Vichy France to the Nazis. This stand of the Catholic clergy of France was recently praised by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Michael J. Ready, general secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, in a statement issued by him at Washington. The following is quoted from Monsignor Ready's statement:

It is a courageous thing that the French Catholics have done in helping persecuted Jews in occupied and unoccupied France. Catholic protests against the inhuman mass deportations of Jews to Nazi territory and the sheltering of Jewish children is a worthy example of the following of Christ.

Archbishop Jarius Saliege, of Toulouse, where several concentration camps are located, has issued a pastoral letter saying, "That children, women, men, fathers, mothers should be treated as a wretched herd \* \* \*, and embarked to unknown destinations was a sad spectacle reserved for our times to see. Lord have pity on us! Our Lady, pray for France!"

It is to be expected that the Nazi regime, which fears above everything the power of truth and good will among men, would suppress the archbishop's pastoral letter of protest.

It is to be expected that Pierre Laval, puppet of the Nazis, a man who sold his soul and his country to the barbarous Nazi invaders of his land, would order the arrest of Catholic priests who have aided the Jews.

We, in the United States, Catholic priest and layman alike, cannot condemn too strongly the well-known Nazi persecution of religion. We thrill to the knowledge that our bishops and priests abroad, without fear, without concern for themselves, have taken up the cause of brethren whose sufferings under the Nazis have been horrible beyond human belief.

Our prayers and our thoughts are with them. Truly, they follow in the path of Christ.

Mr. President, these two latest political moves of Laval may be only forerunners of other Hitler-dictated acts of the future. They certainly do not inspire any confidence in continued truce between the United States and occupied France. Hitler's philosophy of force is predicated on lies, treachery, and deceit. Our successful prosecution of the war can be seriously threatened by further "collaboration" of Laval and Hitler in the disposition of the French West African base at Dakar and of the French posses-

sions in the Caribbean. Can we afford to take further chances with the monstrous Laval and Vichy France?

If we do not act now, by occupying the French possessions in the Caribbean, will Laval be with us or with Hitler when he is put to the test? I believe the answer is that Laval will be with Hitler. We should not risk any longer the possibility that these strategic areas may become bridgeheads from which Hitler can send submarines to prey on our shipping and from which land-based planes may bomb our cities. To do less than to protect ourselves from this dangerous possibility, in the light of fast-moving events in Vichy France, may be inexcusable if we guess wrong. Great Britain's action in Madagascar sets the example and precedent for us to follow.

We have no design on these possessions other than for our own protection, and, therefore, we can assure the residents and citizens of the islands that they need not fear for their personal safety and security.

As to Dakar, fear is now expressed by our sister republic to the south, Brazil, that Dakar may be used by Hitler to base an attack across the Atlantic.

Although the danger to this country from Dakar is not so imminent as from the Caribbean French possessions, we might find it desirable to cooperate with the British and with Brazil if it is deemed necessary to occupy Dakar.

Mr. President, at this point I desire to insert in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Buffalo Courier Express of September 13, 1942, regarding this perilous situation. I quote from the editorial the following:

The Madagascar campaign thus becomes another undeclared war between the British and the Vichy French. The Vichy French won't fight the Axis, which has reduced France to vassalage, but they have no hesitation in fighting the Allies, one of whose war aims is the restoration of France as a free nation.

If a government is neither friendly nor neutral, it must be considered hostile. As far as the Allies are concerned, the Vichy regime manifests neither friendliness nor neutrality. It should be made to pay for its hostility.

I now ask that the editorial in full may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE in the chair). Without objection, the editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express of September 13, 1942]

#### VICHY NO NEUTRAL

If anybody still needs to be told where the Vichy government of what's left of France stands in this war, the present campaign in Madagascar ought to furnish the answer.

Madagascar is a big island off the south-east coast of Africa. It controls the route by which supplies go around the Cape of Good Hope to Egypt, India, Russia, and Australia. In enemy hands it would be a menace of the utmost gravity.

Last May the British seized the big naval base of Diego Suarez at the northern tip of Madagascar to forestall Japanese or other Axis occupation. Both Britain and the United States assured the Vichy Government that Madagascar would remain French, but that the United Nations could not afford to see it fall into the hands of the Axis.



The present campaign was aimed at the three key ports of Majunga Harbor, Morondava, and Ambanja—all on the Mozambique Channel, where Japanese submarines have been active lately. The British said they acted only after Madagascar authorities had refused to cooperate in making the island safe for the United Nations against the Axis. The British asserted that remote coves were being used as refueling bases for Jap submarines and that German agents were being assisted by Madagascar officials on orders from Vichy.

The Madagascar campaign thus becomes another undeclared war between the British and the Vichy French. The Vichy French won't fight the Axis, which has reduced France to vassalage, but they have no hesitation in fighting the Allies, one of whose war aims is the restoration of France as a free nation.

If a government is neither friendly nor neutral, it must be considered hostile. As far as the Allies are concerned, the Vichy regime manifests neither friendliness nor neutrality. It should be made to pay for its hostility.

Mr. MEAD. A hint, Mr. President, that the United States may seize French possessions in the Caribbean and cooperate with the British in seizing the French West African base at Dakar was given by the Army and Navy Journal in a very recent issue. It attracted attention because of the reputed closeness of the publication to the armed services. I quote from that journal:

Vichy is apprehensive that the United States will seize the French Caribbean territories, and they have reason for their fear. The negotiations instituted with the Governor General of those territories have not been concluded, and there is no doubt that prolonged delay in meeting our demands will cause us to act. There is also the matter of Dakar, which is in the German mind, and events may compel us to cooperate with the British in seizing that base, the more important now because Brazil is at war and it might serve as a jumping-off place for planes operating against our South American Ally. The significance of the presence of United States troops in Africa is fully appreciated by Berlin and Rome, for it is proof that we will not hesitate to take any strategic area which would be dangerous to our safety.

The publication observed that "we are talking 'tough' to the Vichy government, and implementing our words with deeds."

I quote further from the Army and Navy Journal:

In the matter of action, our flying fortresses will continue to bomb factories in France turning out war materials for the Axis, and Vichy protests and demands that such measures cease are being disregarded. We have given our official approval to British seizure of all of Madagascar. We have sent troops to French Equatorial Africa, where they will aid the Free French in resisting any Axis attack. We have entered into a formal agreement with the French National Committee under which we will continue to supply the De Gaulleists with defense articles, services, and information, and that committee will reciprocate with such materials, facilities, and information as are available in the territories it controls.

Mr. President, from Rio de Janeiro comes this warning:

RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL, September 19.—When will the United Nations take Dakar? That question is being asked by Brazilians who fear that Germany will anticipate United Nations action and use the Vichy

base in West Africa as a springboard to attack Brazil.

A warning was given by Foreign Minister Oswaldo Aranha last night that Brazilians might expect Germany to try to bomb or even to land parachute troops. He echoed what the man in the street has been thinking and talking about.

The contention is heard here today that the sea lanes of the South Atlantic will not be safe if Dakar is placed openly under the Reich's management and is transformed into a de facto Nazi base.

Mr. President, unhappy France, under Laval's corrupt leadership, has followed the Hitler pattern more subserviently than any of the Quislings of the Nazi subjugated states.

I can never think of this modern-day Judas Iscariot, this present-day Brutus, without seeing, in my mind's eye, the apparition of a fallen France. Her fate has become unspeakably cruel, and her power to fight back diminishes hour by hour. She needs our active aid; sympathy is not enough. France was first of all the victim of Nazi attack, conquest, and occupation, and, second, she was the victim of betrayal by a few Quisling traitors of her own flesh and blood. We hope, over and over again, that the principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity will prevail in unoccupied France so long as any true Frenchman can draw the breath of freedom. In this worthy objective the aid of the United States will be freely given.

We know now that occupied France is the victim of military conquest and that unoccupied France has become the victim of unadulterated disloyalty. Our Government has been patient, commiserative, and indulgent with the Nazi contaminated Vichy regime. There no longer seems to be any sound reason for coddling the despicable Laval and his associate puppets of the Third Reich.

How much longer must Americans deny the truth? How much longer must we credit Vichy with a nobility long since outraged and betrayed?

I speak only for myself, as a Member of the Senate of the United States, but in my judgment, as a result of Laval's contemptible conduct, the time is approaching when we should temporarily sever the Gordian knot that has for so many years bound the United States and the Republic of France. Brave Frenchmen, in whose heart the blood of freedom will ever pulse, will understand the reasons for such action. Washington and Vichy, like Roosevelt and Laval, cannot both endure in the kind of an order Hitler has created. I favor the adoption of a stern policy by the United States, and that we acknowledge the true status of the French puppet Government. I favor all means, within practicability, to occupy all the French possessions in the American sphere of civilization.

If Laval remains in power the day will come when we must make this fateful decision. Long we have hoped that it might not be ours to make. That hope, with the unspeakable Laval in power, now seems gone. Total war permits of no compromise and of the giving of no quarter. The conditions are such that we must recognize the enemy where he is, stamp him for what he is, and, in the

interest of our own preservation and survival, liquidate him with utter force. We will remember Lafayette; we will remember the brave Frenchmen who fought with us in the World War. Today the Frenchmen who love freedom are still our dearest friends. We are happy to have them join with us in the struggle for liberty. We are their true friends in this struggle for human freedom.

It is heartbreaking that our Government must inevitably come to this unhappy conclusion—I trust it can be avoided—but the time approaches when we must prepare to resign ourselves to the situation. Like most of the Frenchmen, we, too, fight to throw off the yoke of aggression. We, too, fight to reestablish decency and democracy in a world made wretched by the foul advocates of treachery, treason, and tragedy.

Frankly, I believe, the whole question of our relations with Vichy France should be restudied in the light of present day events, and a sterner policy adopted while the Laval government remains in power.

Mr. President, from the New York Times I have an article which I wish to have printed as a part of my speech. It indicates that the United States rejects Vichy's raid protest, and warns Laval of more bombings in the future. I believe the State Department has adopted a rightful attitude, and it has my approval. Let us bomb every plant which produces weapons that will destroy freedom from the earth. I ask to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### UNITED STATES REJECTS VICHY RAID PROTEST— WARNS LAVAL OF MORE BOMBINGS

WASHINGTON, September 8.—The United States has informed Pierre Laval, French Chief of Government, through S. Pinkney Tuck, the American Chargé d'Affaires in Vichy, that American aviators will continue to bomb German military properties in France at every opportunity.

The notification was given after Mr. Laval had protested the recent bombings that have caused death and injury to many persons and widespread property damage.

"The American Chargé d'Affaires in Vichy, Mr. S. Pinkney Tuck," the State Department announced today, "was called in yesterday by Mr. Laval who said that in recent bombings of Havre and Rouen by combined military forces of the United Nations a number of people were killed and others wounded and that he, Mr. Laval, desired to enter a protest to the American Government since it was reported some American fliers participated."

"Mr. Tuck's immediate reply was that these air forces were bombing military plants in the employ of Germany and that, of course, the Americans do not desire to see the French people suffer any more than can be avoided, since they have already suffered to an incalculable extent under German occupation, but that Mr. Laval must be assured that the military plants operated by or for Germany and other German military properties in France will be bombed at every opportunity in the future."

Mr. MEAD. I have another article, taken from a recent issue of Newsweek, the heading of which is:

Laval Further Humbles France by Putting Labor in Slavery.

But Two Leaders Remind Him That Liberty Can Never Die in Country of Its Birth.

I quote from the article:

Meanwhile Laval himself has been caught in gusts of wrath. On September 9 it was revealed that the two parliamentary leaders of France, the bearded, patriarchal president of the senate, Jules Jeanneney, 78, and his counterpart in the chamber of deputies, the hulking, 70-year-old Edouard Herriot, had sent a joint letter to Marshal Henri Philippe Petain and Laval, warning them against any move to draw France into war against "our allies."

The eloquent letter, which may come to rank among the great documents of French history, along with Emile Zola's famous "J'accuse" and the spirited defense speeches by Blum and Daladier at the Riom trials, was motivated by a decree ordering the bureaux of both houses of Parliament to cease their functions by August 31. Ever since the Parliament had been actually—though not technically—abolished by Petain, these permanent offices had been the last vestige of popular Government in France.

Jeanneney and Herriot spoke with an abandon rarely heard under dictatorships: "They have misled you if they tell you that the country will follow along the path you are trying to take. It tolerates—because it can do nothing else—the measures and the successive restrictions you have imposed upon it. But do not make the foolish mistake of believing that you can win the adhesion of its spirit or its heart \* \* \*." There followed a sentence that may become one of the classic declarations of this war.

A further warning directed at the unspeakable Laval. The quotation from the letter is as follows:

It is impossible for liberty to die in the country of its birth whence it spread all over the world.

Mr. President, from a recent issue of the newspaper PM I invite attention to another article which I ask unanimous consent to have made a part of my address. The headline reads:

Laval warns church he wants no interference.

In that warning he follows the Hitler technique.

I call attention to two paragraphs in the article:

Laval, taking a page out of Hitler's technique of dealing with the clergy, has ordered Father Chaillet, president of the French Christian Amity Group, which preaches tolerance for all peoples, interned in fixed residence at Privas in southern France.

Laval thus within the month has carried out a full round of Quisling-Hitlerite activity: anti-Semitic measures, Nazi style, conscription of French labor for the Nazis, and now outright war upon French Catholicism. Norway's leading bishops have long been interned, following a struggle with Vidkun Quisling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article presented by the Senator from New York will be printed in the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

#### LAVAL WARNS CHURCH HE WANTS NO INTERFERENCE

Pope Pius yesterday said in a message to the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of Wales:

"We stand horrified before the spectacle of growing violence and fury of this war, which is everywhere spreading devastation and adding incessantly to the long tale of its miseries and sorrows."

He asked for prayers and supplications and "offerings of good works."

In unoccupied France the Pope's message fell on deaf ears, and Pierre Laval demonstrated anew that there can be no peace between a Quisling and the church.

#### HITLER METHOD

Laval, taking a page out of Hitler's technique of dealing with the clergy, has ordered Father Chaillet, president of the French Christian Amity Group, which preaches tolerance for all peoples, interned in fixed residence at Privas in southern France. Chaillet is on the staff of Pierre Cardinal Gerlier, Archbishop of Lyons, who has protested in several letters against the Vichy roundup of foreign Jews for deportation by the Nazis to their homelands.

Laval thus within the month has carried out a full round of Quisling-Hitlerite activity: anti-Semitic measures, Nazi style; conscription of French labor for the Nazis; and now outright war upon French Catholicism. Norway's leading bishops have long been interned, following a struggle with Vidkun Quisling.

Laval made no attempt to conceal his attitude toward the church. United Press quoted him as using these words before a group of German and other foreign correspondents: "The Catholic cardinals and bishops have intervened, but everyone is a master of his own trade. They handle religion—I handle government affairs."

#### FRENCH FIGHT LAVAL ON LABOR ISSUE

The fighting French delegation in the United States of America said yesterday underground French groups opposing the Vichy regime are campaigning against Pierre Laval's moves to send French workers to Germany.

The delegation said it had received copies of a pamphlet distributed by a French resistance group known as Liberation, urging Frenchmen not to respond to Laval's demand for workers to go to Germany. This pamphlet appeared before Laval's recent measures conscripting workers for the Nazis.

It said persons answering his call "will forge chains for France" and will leave their families "facing an infuriated Vichy." It added that nothing could be sent back to families in France from Germany "because the cost of living is high in Germany."

"You will be a convenient hostage for Hitler," it said. "During that time, Laval will be freed of the haunting fear of a popular uprising by keeping your family at his mercy. Through starvation and with the help of his police, he will cunningly lead France and her children toward final slavery for the benefit of his Nazi master."

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, as I said in the beginning, and as I conclude with a denunciation of the recent activities of the Laval government, the wholesale arresting of American citizens, the enslavement in Nazi munitions plants of French labor, and the inhuman and cruel persecution and exile of the Jews, I believe that because of these activities, and because of the pattern already set by Great Britain, it is appropriate, as was well said in the article from the Army and Navy Journal, for our country, and for all the countries of the United Nations, to adopt a sterner attitude with regard to Vichy France. I believe the day will come in the very near future when such an attitude will be vindicated throughout the world.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the address of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] raises, in my mind at least, some issues of propriety and official conduct to which I must make brief reference.

The Senate and House of Representatives of the United States are great and powerful bodies. In them rests the legislative power of the people of the United States. But among those powers is not included the conduct of our foreign relations, and among those powers is not included the conduct of military and naval operations. In time of war our foreign relations are inevitably intermixed with military and naval problems.

As to the government at Vichy, I shall express no animosity and no favoritism, but I desire to point out to the Senator from New York, and to other Senators who may feel an urge now and then to make remarks similar to those delivered by the Senator from New York, that in the field of foreign affairs the Constitution vests the duty of dealing with foreign governments in the President of the United States, and inferentially, although there was no Secretary of State at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, in the Secretary of State as the agent and servant of the President.

Mr. President, in the conduct of foreign relations it is never the function of the Government of the United States to become involved in the domestic quarrels and the domestic problems of the nations with which we deal, unless such problems have a direct effect upon the national interest of the people of the United States or the interest of some citizen.

The republic of France has a glorious and magnificent past. We cannot forget that in the dark and tragic days of the American Revolution, when the fortunes of war were not favorable in all particulars to the Colonies, France came to our aid and succor, and that the presence of a French army and a French fleet made possible the victory at Yorktown and the achievement of independence.

France has been, as we all know, a great influence in Europe in behalf of free government, legislative institutions, and the liberty of the individual. Poor old France has fallen upon evil days. I cannot believe that the French people, the great mass of the French people, are lacking in sympathy with the United States and our national aspirations and our national objectives. We must remember that France has the iron heel of the conqueror upon her neck. The French people have no freedom or liberty of action. We should bear in mind these circumstances in dealing with whatever government happens for the moment to rule over France.

Mr. President, I happen to know that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State have been giving very close attention to all the questions raised by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and to our dealings with the government located at Vichy and I hope that Senators and Members of the other House will be content to allow the President and the Secretary of State, who have vastly more information and more knowledge and more intimate contact than Members of the Congress can possibly have, to deal with this situation unhampered and untied by congressional or senatorial efforts to mold or shape their opinions or to direct their course.



When the makers of the Constitution sat in Philadelphia they wisely entrusted the conduct of foreign affairs to the President of the United States. During the days of the Confederation, and prior thereto, during the days of the Revolution, a congressional committee had struggled with foreign affairs. There was, of course, no President. The experience of the Colonies, and then of the States, during that period was unfortunate. It was found that a congressional committee could not effectively handle the foreign relations of the United States. So the Convention, knowing the background and being aware that all other governments, present and past, had lodged in their chief executives the responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs, placed control of such matters in the President of the United States.

Mr. President, this does not mean that the President, in the conduct of foreign relations, has autocratic or imperial power. The Senate has a check upon the Executive in the refusal of its consent to treaties or obligations which he may assume. The House of Representatives has certain constitutional functions with relation to appropriations and revenues which at least indirectly constitute a check upon the President of the United States. But foreign relations are of such a delicate character, they call for so much of intimate, behind-the-scenes contact, that we cannot transact that kind of business upon the floor of the Senate.

I hope Senators will be very cautious. I hope they will consult their judgment and their sense of propriety, before they make statements which will be heralded in the press here and in foreign countries, perhaps throughout the world, as indicative of the attitude of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, so far as the possessions of France in the Western Hemisphere are concerned, I wish to say that the United States, I feel sure, will conduct itself toward those possessions in our own national interests. If they should be used by enemy powers, if they should be permitted to fall into the hands of aggressors against us, our adversaries, and their resources and agencies should be turned against the interests of this Government, of course the Government would strike in the manner which is best suited to our national interests and our self-defense.

Let me point out to the Senate that the French Government still has a great and powerful navy. That navy has not yet been enlisted against the Government of the United States. But it might be; it could be. By unnecessarily taking attitudes of hostility there might arise such a situation that the French fleet could be arrayed against the Government of the United States and its interests. Let me remind Senators that there is a considerable French army in North Africa, in Algiers and in Morocco. It has not yet taken the field or been turned against the United States or the United Nations. It could be. Pray God it never will be.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CONNALLY. I gladly yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, of course, knows, as I do, that the Foreign Relations Committee has had before it in executive session various eminent officials intimately familiar with the relations of the United States toward the Vichy government, who discussed those relations in great detail with the Foreign Relations Committee. That did not occur because we had any legal or constitutional right, even if we wanted to, to interfere with the policy of the President of the United States with regard to the Vichy government or any other government; but for the information of the committee our relations with the Vichy government were discussed; and I think I am very safe in saying that there was no doubt left in the mind of any member of that committee that the policy pursued by the President of the United States was eminently wise and eminently in the interest of the success of the efforts of the United States and the other United Nations to win the war.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri, who is an able and active member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is true, as suggested by the Senator from Missouri, that the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, desiring to keep the Senate advised, if necessary, and to keep itself advised, about all angles of these relationships, have had before it Admiral Leahy, who was stationed for a considerable period at Vichy as our Ambassador to the Vichy government. We have had officials from the State Department from time to time appear before us, and, as suggested, after hearing their testimony and the relationships and conditions existing, not alone in territorial France but in the West Indian possessions, I feel that I speak the sentiments of every member of the committee, both the majority and the minority, when I say that we felt that the policy being pursued by the President of the United States, and by the State Department under his direction, was one of wisdom, was one of safety for the national interest, and one which was calculated to further the war interests and the prosecution of the war in behalf of the people of the United States and the United Nations operating with us.

So, Mr. President, realizing that this is a field into which Congress cannot safely enter, in which the Senate cannot with any degree of wisdom or authority intervene, I trust that Senators and Members of the other House will be content to trust the President of the United States, who has daily information of the most intimate character with relation to all aspects of this matter. Amidst his other burdens, amidst the other pressing loads which bear him down, I hope that Senators and Representatives will not add to his burdens, and will not increase the

harassment under which he suffers, by pressing here in the Senate or in the House of Representatives these delicate, or these dangerous, if I may use the term, references to foreign relations and to foreign nations.

Mr. President, I mean no personal reflection upon the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], with whom I enjoy the most cordial relations, and I hope that he will not entertain any unfair implications. I speak for myself as well as for the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], with whom I have the most friendly and affectionate relations. I mean to direct my statement to everyone in the Senate or out of the Senate, or in the other House or out of the other House. I feel very strongly that the national interest requires that we follow the leadership of the President of the United States in dealing with foreign nations. He is not alone Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, but he is the director of the foreign relations of this Nation, which essentially are so intermingled with the conduct of the war that they cannot be disentwined. The skein cannot be unwound with safety to the people of the United States.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, I agree absolutely with every word that has been said by the Senator from Texas on this subject.

I ask the Senator from Texas if he does not think that what he said about interference with our diplomatic relations should apply with redoubled force to loose-jawed talk by civilians about technical military and naval strategic decisions, such as the decision with regard to a second front?

Mr. CONNALLY. I believe I know to what the Senator from Missouri indirectly refers. I do not mind saying in this presence—and it is not any interference with the official action of anybody—that I think it is most unfortunate that Mr. Willkie should be so free in his comments and newspaper headlines while he is in Russia. From those remarks it might be implied that there was some friction or irritation between the United States Government and that of Russia.

Mr. President, since this matter has been brought before the Senate I cannot refrain from expressing my great admiration for the heroism, sacrifice, and far-flung gallantry of the Russian people in this great crisis. I do not believe that Stalin or the great military commanders of Russia entertain any feeling of resentment or bitterness toward the United States or any lack of appreciation for the efforts which the United States has put forth in the past toward sending arms, munitions, food, and supplies to succor the Russian armies. The daily press reveals from time to time that convoys from our own shores, bearing arms purchased by the Treasury of our own land and supplies purchased by taxes raised from the American people, have been going to Archangel and Murmansk in aid of the Russian forces.

They have been going there at tremendous risk. Some of them have gone to the bosom of the deep.

Mr. President, I do not believe that a brave and heroic people such as the Russians can be indifferent to the fact that we are extending all the aid which is possible at the moment, and that our arms may not be long enough to reach to Stalingrad, where with unmatched courage the Russian armies are now resisting the wild waves of military might and power. God knows, our hearts are with them; and when the time and opportunity come we shall give to the Russians other aid and assistance.

We stand by Russia in this great struggle. She has presented one of the marvels of history. I shall repeat some of the things which I said a few days ago. Russia, a great country, was at peace with the world, supposedly enjoying an entente with Germany. Suddenly, and without any warning whatever, she was treacherously assailed by the military might of Germany. We know how heroically she has resisted. We know with what granite determination she has stood upon her own soil and upon her own hearthstone and in many instances driven back the invader. She still continues to resist.

I pray God that history may repeat itself. One hundred and thirty years ago Napoleon, then the imperial military master of Europe, led a colossal army into Russia, drove the Russians before him, and captured Moscow, thinking that he would conquer the Russian people; but, thank God, the Russian Army remained intact. It retreated beyond Moscow. Marshal Kutusov kept his armies intact. One hundred and thirty years ago this month Napoleon was forced, through military necessity, to begin to plan a retreat from Russia—a retreat which was engulfed in misery, a retreat which was marked by starving and freezing soldiers, a retreat which brought back from the snows of Russia only a squad of the magnificent army of 600,000 men whom he had led, as he thought, in triumph to the conquest of Russia.

Pray God that whatever may be the result of existing conflicts in Russia, her armies may remain intact. If they do, pray God that history may repeat itself, and that what occurred to Napoleon 130 years ago may occur to this modern military monster, and that the Russians may be able to repel from their land invasion, attack, and disaster. She is magnificently aiding the democracies of the world. God bless old Russia. God bless the brave men who are fighting under her flag.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I have before me a quotation from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I should like to read as a part of my remarks. It occurs to me that when the powerful chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee lays down a rule of policy it should receive our attention. More than that, it should act as a guide for the Senate as a body, to follow as closely as each individual Senator believes it affects the situation he so well brings to mind.

I probably can be pardoned if I have done something which is unwise and

lacking in prudence, but I cannot be criticized if it has always been done. I cannot be criticized if the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the activities in the other House only recently is filled with similar statements. I cannot be criticized if a few short days ago one of our own Members made a statement even stronger than the statement I made.

It ought to be understood, Mr. President, if under the leadership of the new chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate no Senator ought to rise in the Senate and voice his opinion as to a change in policy affecting our relations with other nations. I am very glad to hear the distinguished Senator from Texas, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, plead with us that we follow closely and cooperate diligently with the President of the United States. I am glad to have that policy seconded by the distinguished Senator from Missouri. I wish to say to both of them that in connection with our relations with foreign governments, in votes upon the floor of the Senate—which had more to do with such relations than mere discussion of such matters—I stood by the President and supported him in every major effort which he recommended to the Congress.

Mr. President, if it is unwise for us to talk about tactical problems such as affect the Army and Navy, if it is improvident for us to discuss foreign affairs as they were discussed recently in the other House, with no criticism from the chairman of the House committee, if it was all right for Members of the Senate to rise in righteous indignation which led to the crystallization of the foreign policy in 1812, if it was again their right to lead the fight which led to a break with Spain in 1898, then we ought to know whether or not we have the same right today.

If there is to be a new policy, and if we are to give up the privilege which has been exercised in the past, and for the duration yield that prerogative—even though we may wisely and diplomatically practice it—as it pertains to the Army and Navy, the State Department, and perhaps one or two other departments, we should know it.

Mr. President, I have just read a forceful speech made in the British Parliament, which probably led to the seizure of the entire island of Madagascar. I read no criticism by the foreign affairs department of that great government. It occurs to me that it was anxious for guidance, direction, cooperation, and counsel.

I should like to have the policy determined, so that we may know what our privileges are. I wish to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement made by the able junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] on June 25. The statement is as follows:

While I am on my feet, I shall ask Senators to indulge me a little further. Beware a traitor. He will strike when we least expect it. He will wait for his opportunity to dart at his prey. I do not trust the Vichy government. As an armchair diplomat, without a full knowledge of the facts, but judging merely from newspaper observations—

That is what I did. I read from the New York Times. I read from PM. I read from the Army and Navy Journal. I read from the Buffalo Courier-Express.

The junior Senator from Louisiana continued:

We have been too gracious with Laval and his clique. Those leaders are praying for a Hitler victory which, to my mind, is contrary to the wishes of the brave French people. I am convinced even if we should break with Vichy, we would maintain the good wishes of the real French patriots. My guess is that they despise Laval, Darlan, and other followers as much as they hate Hitler. I presume that we have been patient with them in the hope that the French Fleet would not be used against us, but let Hitler make a good showing in the Middle East, and we will see what happens. My prediction is we will have another cowardly thrust in the back a la Mussolini.

Mr. President, when I commenced my remarks I said that I favored a stern policy—that was the policy I laid down—by our State Department in its future treatment of the Vichy French Government. I based my statement on the cruel, brutal, inhuman treatment of the French labor prisoners and the French war prisoners, and I predicated it on the cruel, brutal, diabolical treatment of the Jews in France, crowded along the boundary of a country which wants to expel them, and along the boundary of a country which will not let them in. I predicated my statement on the inhuman mass arrests of American citizens who have been hounded and rooted up and concentrated in a zoo in Paris. I say that I believe that the State Department would like to know the attitude of the American people, the attitude of their representatives, if it was made plain to them along constructive lines.

I say to you, Mr. President, that the record of this Congress is replete with statements similar to the statement I have made. Either the Members of Congress are wrong in commenting on military matters and State Department matters and should be shut off and muzzled, or the criticism which just now was leveled at my address was a little inopportune. We should have a well-defined policy; and I, for one, would be the last to violate it.

#### AUTHORIZATION TO REPORT TAX BILL

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be granted the privilege of reporting to the Senate during the contemplated recess the tax bill which we expect to have ready for report over the week end.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, when does the able Senator think the bill will be ready to be reported?

Mr. GEORGE. Tomorrow; Friday.

Mr. McNARY. I think that probably this is an appropriate time to have an understanding relative to the time when the bill shall be considered by the Senate. For several reasons—among them because of the enforced absence of a few of the Members of the Senate—I should very much prefer that the bill be taken up for consideration on Tuesday. If I could have such an understanding, I should not object to the request made by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia.



Mr. GEORGE. I had hoped that we might take up the bill on Monday.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that.

Mr. GEORGE. However, Monday might be largely taken up with an explanatory statement regarding the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, the measure is an extremely complicated one, and must necessarily be so.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes.

Mr. McNARY. I assume that no opportunity will be had to consider the bill prior to the session of the Senate on Monday.

Mr. GEORGE. I think that copies of the bill and the report will be available tomorrow; but, of course, during Saturday and Sunday, Senators would not be very likely to give very much attention to the matter.

Mr. McNARY. It may be that copies of the bill and of the report will be available tomorrow; but if they are to be available tomorrow, why does the Senator request unanimous consent that he be allowed to report the bill during the recess of the Senate?

Mr. GEORGE. Because I anticipate that the Senate will not be in session tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me say that it is expected that the Senate will be in session tomorrow.

Mr. GEORGE. I understood that it was expected that a recess would be taken from today until Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; that is not the present understanding. The situation in regard to the anti-inflation bill is that the Members of the House had been assured that they would not be called back for action on it until Friday, tomorrow; and thus it would be impossible for the conferees on the bill to meet until tomorrow. We hope that the conferees will meet and will submit a conference report on the bill during the day tomorrow, and that the Senate will immediately thereafter consider the conference report. For that reason, it will be necessary that the Senate hold a session tomorrow.

Mr. GEORGE. Then I shall renew my request tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection to having an understanding that the able senior Senator from Georgia may report the bill, but I should object to having action taken on the bill on Monday. I think my position on the matter is a fair one.

Mr. GEORGE. Perhaps it would be agreeable to have the bill reported tomorrow, and to take up the matter of fixing a date for its consideration.

Mr. McNARY. I repeat that I have no objection to having a general discussion of the bill on Monday, provided that no action be taken on the amendments to the bill until Tuesday. Such a program would accommodate some Senators whom I have in mind.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator might have an understanding, although I do not think the situation would be otherwise without such an understanding, that no vote be taken on Monday on the amendments to the bill.

Mr. McNARY. I desired to be able to advise Senators now absent that no

action would be taken on the bill on Monday.

Mr. GEORGE. In considering a bill of the character of the tax bill it is very difficult to agree that no action shall be taken. However, I should be pleased to enter into an agreement that if the bill be taken up on Monday, no action will be taken on any controverted matter.

Mr. McNARY. Such an agreement would mean that any Member of the Senate might object.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; any Member of the Senate might ask that the consideration of any matter go over.

Mr. McNARY. Very well; such an agreement would reach the same point in a different way.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Georgia whether he has obtained unanimous consent to file the report of the committee during the recess of the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. I did not press the matter, because the majority leader has advised us that it is anticipated that the Senate will be in session tomorrow. In making my request I proceeded on the theory that following today's session the Senate would not meet until Monday.

Mr. WALSH. So the Senator will be in a better position to file the report tomorrow; will he?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I should have no objection to the filing of the report now, provided that we might have a complete understanding that no objected-to amendments would be acted upon on Monday.

Mr. GEORGE. I am satisfied that we should not dispose of any objected-to amendment on Monday, in any event; but I should be very glad to enter into such an agreement.

Mr. McNARY. Then I should be glad to consent that the Senator make his report now.

Mr. GEORGE. Then, Mr. President, I renew my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order previously entered, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, and the clerk will proceed to call the measures on the calendar, beginning at the end of the last call.

#### REQUISITION OF PROPERTY REQUIRED FOR DEFENSE PURPOSES

The bill (S. 2776) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect, was announced as first in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, from the title of the bill I am unable to determine the substance of the measure. Unless an explanation is given, I shall ask that the bill go over.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I trust that the Senator will not ask that

the bill go over. Two years ago the Congress of the United States gave the President authority to requisition property belonging to foreign countries which had been purchased by them for use in war efforts. The time limit on the existing act is up, and the bill would simply extend to the 30th of June, 1944, the authority now granted by the act. It would give the President the right to requisition property which has been ordered by other governments but which stands on our rails or in our warehouses, and would authorize him to use it for the war effort, with compensation paid to the owners.

Mr. McNARY. I am satisfied with that brief explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the first sentence of the first section of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941 (55 Stat. 742), is amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1943," and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1944," so that it will read as follows: "That whenever the President, during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, but not later than June 30, 1944, determines that (1) the use of any military or naval equipment, supplies, or munitions, or component parts thereof, or machinery, tools, or materials necessary for the manufacture, servicing, or operation of such equipment, supplies, or munitions is needed for the defense of the United States; (2) such need is immediate and impending and such as will not admit of delay or resort to any other source of supply; and (3) all other means of obtaining the use of such property for the defense of the United States upon fair and reasonable terms have been exhausted, he is authorized to requisition such property for the defense of the United States upon the payment of fair and just compensation for such property to be determined as hereinafter provided, and to dispose of such property in such manner as he may determine is necessary for the defense of the United States."

Sec. 2. Section 2 of the act of October 16, 1941 (55 Stat. 742), is amended by striking out the date "December 31, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "December 31, 1944," so that it will read as follows:

"Sec. 2. Whenever the President determines that property acquired under this act and retained is no longer needed for the defense of the United States, he shall, if the original owner desires the property and pays the fair value thereof, return such property to the owner; but, in any event, property so acquired and retained shall, if the owner desires the property and pays the fair value thereof, be returned to the owner not later than December 31, 1944."

#### BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2572) to permit defendants to waive prosecution by indictment was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, is there any explanation of the bill other than the report thereon? The bill is a rather unusual one; and if there be no other explanation, I am constrained to object to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

# COMPILATION OF FEDERAL LAWS REGULATING CARRIERS

The resolution (S. Res. 270) to supplement compilation of Federal laws regulating carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby requested to prepare in such manner as is deemed by it to be necessary and desirable in the circumstances and transmit to the Senate a manuscript in form suitable to be printed, to supplement and bring as closely to date as is practicable Senate Document No. 166, Seventieth Congress, first session; Senate Document No. 139, Seventy-third Congress, second session; and Senate Document No. 202, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, entitled "Compilation of Federal Laws Relating to the Regulation of Carriers Subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, With Digests of Pertinent Decisions of the Federal Courts and the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Text of or Reference to General Rules and Regulations," and that such manuscript when transmitted by the Commission to the Secretary of the Senate be printed as a Senate document.

## SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AGAINST MEXICO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2528) to provide for the settlement of claims of the Government of the United States on behalf of American nationals against the Government of Mexico comprehended within the terms of agreements concluded by the United States and Mexico, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "Settlement of Mexican Claims Act of 1942."

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the American Mexican Claims Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") and to be composed of three persons to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary at the rate of \$7,500 a year. One of such members shall be designated by the President as Chairman of the Commission. Two members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. Any vacancy that may occur in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of an original appointment.

(b) The Commission may, subject to the civil-service laws, employ a secretary, and such legal, clerical, and technical assistants as may be necessary to carry out its functions under this act, and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

(c) The Commission is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out its functions under this act.

(d) The authority of the Commission under this act, and the terms of office of its members, shall terminate at the expiration of 2 years after the date on which a majority of its members first appointed take office, but the President may by Executive order fix an earlier termination date. Upon the termination of the authority of the Commission, all books, records, documents, and other papers in the possession of the Commission shall be deposited with the Department of State.

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall have authority to examine and render final decisions in the following categories of claims

on behalf of American nationals against the Government of Mexico—

(1) Agrarian claims which arose between January 1, 1927, and August 30, 1927, inclusive, and which were not filed with the General Claims Commission established pursuant to the convention between the United States and Mexico signed September 8, 1923 (43 Stat. 1730);

(2) Agrarian claims which are predicated upon provisional expropriation decrees signed between August 31, 1927, and December 1, 1938, inclusive, but not published prior to December 1, 1938, and which were not filed with the Agrarian Claims Commission established pursuant to the agreement between the United States and Mexico effected by exchange of notes signed on November 9 and November 12, 1938, respectively (hereinafter referred to as the Agrarian Claims Agreement of 1938);

(3) Agrarian claims which arose between December 1, 1938, and October 6, 1940, inclusive, and which were not filed with the Agrarian Claims Commission on or before July 31, 1939;

(4) All other claims which arose between January 1, 1927, and October 6, 1940, inclusive, and which involve international responsibility of the Government of Mexico as a consequence of damage to, or loss or destruction of, or wrongful interference with, property of American nationals; except (A) claims predicated upon acts of Mexican authorities in relation to petroleum properties; and (B) claims which were not filed with the General Claims Commission prior to August 31, 1927, and which are predicated upon default of payment of the principal or interest on bonds issued or guaranteed by the Government of Mexico;

(5) Claims or parts of claims which were filed with the General Claims Commission, and also with the Special Claims Commission established pursuant to the convention between the United States and Mexico signed September 10, 1923 (43 Stat. 1722), and with respect to which no final determination has been made;

(6) Any claim in which a decision was not rendered by the General Claims Commission in conformity with the rules of procedure adopted by such Commission; and

(7) Any claim decided by the General Claims Commission in which the United States filed a petition for rehearing.

(b) All claims in the categories specified in subsection (a) may be presented for any losses or damages suffered by American nationals by reason of losses or damages suffered by any foreign corporation, company, association, or partnership in which such nationals have, or have had, a substantial and bona fide interest: *Provided*, That in all such cases the claimant shall present to the Commission either an allotment to him by the corporation, company, association, or partnership of his proportionate share of the loss or damage suffered, or other evidence thereof which is satisfactory to the Commission.

(c) All decisions by the Commission with respect to the claims in the categories specified in subsection (a) shall be based upon such evidence and written legal contentions as may be presented within such period as may be prescribed therefor by the Commission, and upon the results of such independent investigation with respect to such claims as the Commission may deem it advisable to make.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall also have authority as hereinafter provided to examine and render final decisions (1) in those cases in which the two Commissioners designated by the United States and Mexico, respectively, pursuant to the General Claims Protocol between the United States and Mexico signed April 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 1844), failed to reach agreements, and the Commissioner so designated by the United States made ap-

praisals, and (2) in those cases in which appraisals were made by the Commissioner designated by the United States pursuant to the Agrarian Claims Agreement of 1938.

(b) In connection with such cases, the Commission shall, as soon as practicable, notify each claimant, or his attorney, by registered mail to his last-known address, of the appraisals so made. Within a period of 30 days after the mailing of such notice, the claimant shall notify the Commission in writing whether the appraisal so made is accepted as final and binding, or whether a petition for review will be filed as provided in subsection (c). If the claimant fails to so notify the Commission in writing within such period, or if the Commission is notified within such period of the final acceptance of such appraisal, it shall, at the expiration of such period, enter an award on the basis of such appraisal and certify such award to the Secretary of the Treasury.

(c) In any case in which the Commission is so notified in writing that a petition for review will be filed, the Commission shall prescribe a reasonable period, which may be extended in the discretion of the Commission, within which such petition, together with written legal contentions in support thereof, shall be filed. If no petition for review is filed within the period or any extension thereof prescribed by the Commission, it shall enter an award on the basis of the appraisal in such case and certify such award to the Secretary of the Treasury.

(d) In any case in which a petition for review is filed within the period prescribed in subsection (c), the Commission shall decide the case upon the basis of (1) the record before the Commissioner at the time his appraisal in such case was made, and (2) the written legal contentions filed with such petition or in connection therewith: *Provided*, That the Commission may receive and consider any additional evidence which it deems appropriate in the interest of justice and equity, and the Commission may, in its discretion, order the production of further evidence.

SEC. 5. (a) All claims decided by the Commission shall be decided in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Convention of September 8, 1923, the Convention of September 10, 1923, or the Agrarian Claims Agreement of 1938, as the case may be; and all claims decided by the Commission which are not within the purview of either of such Conventions or such Agreement shall be decided in accordance with the applicable principles of international law, justice, and equity.

(b) Each decision by the Commission pursuant to this act shall be by majority vote, shall state the reasons for such decision, and shall constitute a full and final disposition of the case in which the decision is rendered.

(c) In connection with any claim decided by the Commission in which an award is made, the Commission may, upon the written request of the claimant or any attorney heretofore or hereafter employed by such claimant, determine and apportion the just and reasonable attorneys' fees for services rendered with respect to such claim, but the total amount of the fees so determined in any case shall not exceed 10 percent of the amount of the award, unless in special circumstances the Commission shall find that a larger fee is just and reasonable. Any fees so determined shall be entered as a part of such award, and payment thereof shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury. Any person who accepts any compensation for services rendered with respect to such claim which, when added to any amount previously received on account of such services, will exceed the amount of fees so determined by the Commission, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$1,000.

(d) The Commission shall, upon the completion of its work, certify in duplicate to



the Secretary of State and to the Secretary of the Treasury the following:

- (1) A list of all claims disallowed;
- (2) A list of all claims allowed, in whole or in part (together with the amount of each claim and the amount awarded thereon), which have not been previously certified under sections 4 (b) and 4 (c);
- (3) A copy of the decision rendered in each case; and
- (4) A statement of the expenses of the Commission under this act.

SEC. 6. (a) For the purposes of this act, the following determinations heretofore made with respect to claims on behalf of American nationals against the Government of Mexico shall be regarded as final and binding:

- (1) Decisions rendered by the General Claims Commission, except in the cases referred to in paragraphs (6) and (7) of section 3 (a) of this act; and
- (2) Agreements reached by the Commissioners designated by the Governments of the United States and Mexico, respectively, pursuant to the General Claims Protocol between the United States and Mexico signed April 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 1844).

(b) The Secretary of State shall, as soon as possible, certify to the Secretary of the Treasury lists of the awards and agreements made in favor of American nationals in the cases referred to in subsection (a).

SEC. 7. For the purposes of this act, appraisals made in favor of American nationals in terms of Mexican currency shall be converted into currency of the United States at the exchange rate of \$0.4985, and in any case in which an award or appraisal made in favor of an American national bears interest, such interest shall be simple interest computed at 6 percent per annum and shall run from the date specified in such award or appraisal to November 19, 1941.

SEC. 8. (a) There is hereby created in the Treasury of the United States a special fund to be known as the "Mexican Claims Fund," hereinafter called the "fund." All payments authorized under section 9 of this act shall be disbursed from the fund, and all amounts covered into the Treasury to the credit of the fund, less the amount of the deduction provided for in section 10 (b), are hereby permanently appropriated for the making of the payments authorized by such section.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cover into the fund—

- (1) the sum of \$3,000,000, representing the total amount of payments heretofore made by the Government of Mexico under the Agrarian Claims Agreement of 1938;
- (2) the sum of \$3,000,000 which was paid by the Government of Mexico upon exchange of ratifications of the convention signed November 19, 1941;

(3) such other sums as are paid by the Government of Mexico pursuant to the provisions of the said convention; and

(4) the sum of \$533,658.95, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and which represents the total amount of awards and appraisals, plus interest, made with respect to claims on behalf of Mexican nationals against the Government of the United States which were filed with the General Claims Commission.

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, out of the sums covered into the fund pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, to make payments on account of awards and appraisals certified pursuant to sections 4 (b), 4 (c), and 6 of this act, of an amount not to exceed 30 percent of the award or appraisal in each case, exclusive of interest.

(d) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, to the extent that it may be possible to do so out of the sums covered into the fund pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, and after making the deduction provided for in section 10 (b)—

(1) to make similar payments of not to exceed 30 percent on account of the principal amount of the awards certified pursuant to section 5 (d) of this act;

(2) after completing the payments prescribed by paragraph (1) of this subsection, to make payments, from time to time and in ratable proportions, on account of all awards and appraisals certified pursuant to the provisions of this act, according to the proportions which the respective awards and appraisals, exclusive of interest, bear to the total amount in the fund available for distribution at the time such payments are made; and

(3) after payment has been made of the principal amounts of all such awards and appraisals, to make pro rata payments on account of accrued interest on such awards and appraisals as bear interest.

SEC. 9. (a) Subject to the limitations hereinafter provided, payments pursuant to section 8 of this act, the act approved April 10, 1935 (49 Stat. 149), and the joint resolution approved August 25, 1937 (50 Stat. 783), and applications for such payments, shall be made in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

(b) Such payments shall be made only to the person or persons on behalf of whom the award or appraisal is made, except that—

(1) If such person is deceased or is under a legal disability, payment shall be made to his legal representative: *Provided*, That if the amount to be disbursed at any one time is not over \$500 and there is no qualified executor or administrator, payment may be made to the person or persons found by the Secretary of the Treasury to be entitled thereto, without the necessity of compliance with the requirements of law with respect to the administration of estates;

(2) If an award or appraisal is made to the estate of a deceased person, and if there has been no administration of such person's estate, or if the administration of such person's estate has been terminated, payment may be made to the person or persons found by the Secretary of the Treasury to be entitled thereto;

(3) In the case of a partnership or corporation, the existence of which has been terminated and on behalf of which an award or appraisal is made, payment shall be made except as provided in paragraphs (4) and (5), to the person or persons found by the Secretary of the Treasury to be entitled thereto;

(4) If a receiver or trustee for any such partnership or corporation has been duly appointed by a court of competent jurisdiction in the United States and has not been discharged prior to the date of payment, payment shall be made to such receiver or trustee or in accordance with the order of the court;

(5) If a receiver or trustee for any such partnership or corporation, duly appointed by a court of competent jurisdiction in the United States, makes an assignment of the claim, or any part thereof, with respect to which an award or appraisal is made, or makes an assignment of such award or appraisal, or any part thereof, payment shall be made to the assignee, as his interest may appear; and

(6) In the case of an assignment of an award or an appraisal, or any part thereof, which is made in writing and duly acknowledged and filed, after such award or appraisal is certified to the Secretary of the Treasury, payment may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, be made to the assignee, as his interest may appear.

(c) Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury shall find that any person is entitled to any such payment, such finding shall be an absolute bar to recovery by any other person against the United States, its officers,

agents, or employees with respect to such payment.

(d) Any person who makes application for any such payment shall be held to have consented to all the provisions of this act.

(e) The decisions of the Secretary of the Treasury in making such payments shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review by any other officer of the Government.

(f) Nothing in this act shall be construed as the assumption of any liability by the United States for the payment or satisfaction, in whole or in part, of any claim on behalf of any American national against the Government of Mexico.

SEC. 10. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions under this act.

(b) Upon the completion of the work of the Commission, the Secretary of the Treasury shall charge against the fund created by section 8 an amount equal to the expenses of the Commission certified pursuant to section 5 (d). An amount equal to the amount so charged against the fund shall be deducted from the fund and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 11. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall continue to distribute to the beneficiaries of the final awards rendered by the Special Mexican Claims Commission all moneys heretofore or hereafter received from the Government of Mexico pursuant to the Convention signed April 24, 1934, including interest on deferred payments.

(b) So much of the act approved April 10, 1935, and of the joint resolution approved August 25, 1937, as may be inconsistent with this act, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 12. As used in this act—

(a) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, or corporation.

(b) The term "United States," when used in a geographical sense, includes the United States, its Territories, and insular possessions (including the Philippine Islands), and the Canal Zone.

(c) The term "American national" includes (1) any person who is a citizen of the United States, and (2) any person who, though not a citizen of the United States, owes permanent allegiance to the United States.

SEC. 13. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed—

(a) So much of the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1936 (49 Stat. 76), of the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1937 (49 Stat. 1320), and of the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1938 (50 Stat. 271), as reads as follows: "*Provided further*, That from any sums received from the Mexican Government in settlement of a general claim of an American citizen against it, there shall be deducted and deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, 5 percent thereof in reimbursement of the Government of the United States of expenses incurred by it in respect of such claim."

(b) That portion of the joint resolution approved April 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 573), reading as follows: "*Provided*, That any expenditures from the amount herein authorized to be appropriated shall become a first charge upon any moneys received from the Government of Mexico in settlement of the respective claims, and the amount of such expenditures shall be deducted from the first payment by the Mexican Government and deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on behalf of American nationals against the Government of Mexico."

#### PRESERVATION OF NATIONALITY OF CITIZENS RESIDING ABROAD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7152) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like a brief explanation regarding the bill.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, this bill is designed to protect American nationals living abroad against expatriation. It is similar to a bill which was passed last year and to a bill which, as I recall, was passed the previous year. The extension of time expires on October 14 of this year. A great many of our naturalized citizens living in foreign countries have for a long time, as Senators know, been unable, because of the difficulties of travel, to come home, and they will be deprived of their American citizenship unless this proposal becomes a law by the 14th of October. It is a matter which has been considered by the Senate for the last 2 or 3 years, and I am certain that there is no controversy about it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I may say that a distinguished American who is now abroad has communicated with me and stated it would be impossible for him to return in time to safeguard his citizenship under the present law. He said that other Americans also desired the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I can assure the Senator from Massachusetts that that situation prevails in many cases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT—RAILROAD ADJUSTMENTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7121) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce with an amendment on page 22, after line 21, to insert the following:

##### ARTICLE X—TERMINATION OF JURISDICTION

SEC. 755. The jurisdiction conferred upon any court by this chapter shall not be exercised by such court after November 1, 1945, except in respect of any proceeding initiated by filing a petition under section 710 hereof on or before November 1, 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### GRANT OF CERTAIN LANDS TO NEW MEXICO

The bill (S. 2635) to provide for granting to the State of New Mexico the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in New Mexico was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.* That the Commissioner of Work Projects is authorized and directed to grant to the State of New Mexico all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in the State of New Mexico, located in sections 28 and 29, township 16 south, range 11 west, New Mexico principal meridian, upon which a dam and reservoir have been constructed in Bear Canyon, on the Mimbres River, in Grant County, N. Mex., which right, title, and interest were acquired by the United States pursuant to a judgment rendered on April 22, 1942, by the District Court of the United States for the District of New Mexico in an action brought by the United States against J. S. Mitchell, also known as Jake S. Mitchell and J. A. Mitchell, and others, No. 203 Civil.

#### ABOLITION OF GUILFORD COURTHOUSE NATIONAL MILITARY PARK COMMISSION

The bill (H. R. 5719) to abolish the Guilford Courthouse National Military Park Commission, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6657) to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountain National Park from the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask that the bill, the title of which has just been stated, go over for the time being for further study.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### PRINTING IN THE RECORD OF SPEECHES NOT DELIVERED

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement. I do not wish any individual Senator to take anything I may say as criticism of anything he may have done; but I have observed the growing practice in the Senate of inserting material in the body of the RECORD to appear as though it were a speech delivered on the floor.

Mr. President, there never has been in the Senate the practice of extending remarks, such as prevails in the other House, but, even in that body, when remarks are extended, although they are printed in the same type as speeches which are published in the body of the RECORD, they appear in the Appendix; they do not appear in the body of the RECORD as though they had been delivered on the floor at the time debate took place.

So far as the Senate is concerned, I think it is a bad practice. In order that it may not have any reference to any individual Senator, I wish to give notice that in the future, should I be on the

floor when any such request is made, I shall be forced to object.

My reason for that, Mr. President, is that if material which is not delivered on the floor of the Senate appears in the RECORD as having been so delivered, statements thus printed which, perhaps, should be answered or refuted, seem to pass unchallenged. I think it is a bad practice, and, in view of the fact that it has been growing here, I wish to make this announcement so that in every way it may be impersonal, both so far as the past and the future may be concerned.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator is mistaken in his remarks as to the practice in the House of Representatives. I have nothing to say about the Senator's general announcement or purpose, but it is a very frequent thing in the other House for a Representative to be yielded a half minute or a minute, speak a few words, and then obtain consent to revise and extend his remarks, and we find in the body of the RECORD a speech which would require 35 or 40 minutes to deliver. That occurs every day.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator is, of course, very much more familiar with the House practice than am I, but I have noticed that such speeches appear in the Appendix of the RECORD, as I read the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is under a general leave-to-print order. There is a practice in the House of granting general leave to print, and when that is done the speeches appear in the Appendix, but it occurs almost every day that a Member of the House of Representatives will ask permission to address the House for 1 minute or a half a minute and will speak a few sentences, then ask unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks, and put an hour's speech into the RECORD.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not wish to belabor the point, but I refer the Senator to a speech appearing on page A3741 of yesterday's daily RECORD entitled:

Wendell Willkie's Foreign Trip. Speech of Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, September 30, 1942—

The same date as that of the RECORD which I hold in my hand—

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Then the speech appears in the Appendix.

So far as the Senate is concerned, the practice to which I have referred is bad; I am against it; and I shall do what I can to prevent it in the future.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator's objection would not relate, would it, to the case of a Senator introducing a bill and requesting to have printed a memorandum explanatory of the bill?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Not if it appears in small type, but I do not want it to



appear as though the Senator had made a speech concerning his bill.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator is quite right in making his suggestion.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The rules of the Joint Committee on Printing and of the Printing Office are quite clear. It is only because by unanimous consent it is possible to set aside any rules or any practices of the Senate that this has been happening here recently. The situation is well known and well understood by the able reporters who make up the Record. I merely wanted to give this notice that, in the future, if I am present, I shall object when any Senator makes such a request, even if the hour be very late.

Mr. WALSH. I think the Senator's objection is well taken. In fact, the Joint Committee on Printing have discussed on many occasions the desirability of restricting and limiting matters offered for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If I had my personal way, I would have nothing printed in the Appendix of the RECORD except speeches made outside over the radio or in public gatherings by Members of the House and Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I merely desire to add that the able Senator from Wisconsin is right in the position he takes. If such a practice as that to which he refers has grown up, it has been without my notice and knowledge. It has been the unbroken practice of the Senate for 150 years that no speeches shall be included in the RECORD of the day's proceedings which have not been actually delivered on the floor. If there has been a failure to observe that practice, it has escaped me. Whenever I am conscious that the practice is not being followed, I shall object.

I do not know how it can be detected until the RECORD is made the next day. I suppose that when a Senator offers a speech of his own which is not made in actual debate or delivered on the floor and asks unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD, in that case it is the duty of the reporters to see that it is placed in the Appendix of the RECORD. There is some responsibility upon those who have to do with the preparation of the RECORD.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In defense of the able and efficient reporters of the Senate, I wish to say that in the particular instance I have in mind consent was obtained on the floor of the Senate, although it does not appear in the RECORD. It could not appear there because it would be absurd if the request to print preceded and then the speech appeared in body type. It would really be ridiculous. So the reporters, exercising their editorial discretion, left out the colloquy which preceded the request, so that the speech appears in the body of the RECORD as if it had been delivered.

Mr. McNARY. I am not conversant with the instance in question nor am I criticizing the reporters; they could not be any more efficient than they are; but how would it be possible to detect a speech that goes into the RECORD as a

part of the proceedings following a request to print it, when it ought to go into the Appendix? I still think that is the duty of those who prepare the RECORD to see that it goes in the proper place; but, anyway, I am wholly in accord with the observations made by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and have tried many times to see that the rule was not relaxed. Hereafter I shall add a little more spirit to my gentleness.

#### LAND OFFICES AND LAND DISTRICTS IN ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 6601) to reorganize the system of land offices and land districts in Alaska, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### SALE OF LAND IN FLETCHER, OKLA.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2398) authorizing the sale of certain parcels of land reserved for public purposes in the patent issued with respect to the town site of Fletcher, Okla., which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior may issue a patent in fee simple to the town of Fletcher, Okla., under section 22 of the act of May 2, 1890 (26 Stat. 91; 43 U. S. C. 1094), for the tracts in that town reserved for parks, schools, and other public purposes, without inserting in the patent the condition required by such section that the lands shall be maintained for the purposes mentioned.

SEC. 2. The proceeds derived from the sale of such parcels of land shall be used by the Town Board of Fletcher, Okla., first, to repair and improve the water system in such town; and, second, to construct a town building containing, among other things, a fire station, jail, and town hall.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill amending the provisions governing the issuance of patent for certain lands to the town of Fletcher, Okla."

#### COLLECTION PROCEDURE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2691) to facilitate and simplify collection procedure in the Department of the Interior, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the parenthesis, to strike out "and from all other provisions of law requiring the deposit of contracts or other instruments, or copies thereof, in the General Accounting Office, whenever the amount actually becoming due to the Government under the lease, permit, license, contract, agreement, or other instrument involved does not exceed \$300 in any one fiscal year", and to insert "when the lease or other instrument does not require payment to the Government in excess of \$300 in any one fiscal year", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That leases, permits, licenses, contracts, agreements, and other instruments providing for payments to the United States on account of the use of lands

or waters under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, or on account of the sale of products of such lands or waters, or on account of other transactions incident to the administration of such lands or waters, including contributions by cooperators, but excluding sales of used equipment, shall be exempt from the provisions of section 3743 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (title 41, U. S. C., sec. 20), when the lease or other instrument does not require payment to the Government in excess of \$300 in any one fiscal year: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe from time to time regulations requiring that originals or copies of any class or group of documents within the foregoing exemption, in the circumstances and upon the conditions designated by him in such regulations, shall be deposited in the General Accounting Office for audit purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### EXECUTION OF COURT MARTIAL SENTENCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2798) amending the first sentence of Article of War 52, relative to execution of court-martial sentences, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of Article of War 52 (41 Stat. 799) is amended to read as follows:

"The authority competent to order the execution of the sentence of a court martial may, at the time of the approval of such sentence, suspend the execution, in whole or in part, of any such sentence as does not extend to death, and may restore the person under sentence to duty during such suspension; and the Secretary of War, the commanding officer holding general court-martial jurisdiction over any such offender, or the military authority competent to appoint, for the command, exclusive of penitentiaries and the United States Disciplinary Barracks in which the person under sentence is held, a court of the kind that imposed the sentence, may at any time hereafter, while the sentence is being served, suspend the execution, in whole or in part, of the balance of such sentence and restore the person under sentence to duty during such suspension."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, under the existing law, in the case of a special or summary court-martial, the officers who constitute the court may mitigate the sentence. They may not suspend it. To suspend a sentence the approval of the Secretary of War is required. The pending bill was prepared by the War Department to enable special or summary courts to suspend a sentence, and to return a man to duty.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It does not permit them to make the sentence heavier?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. No.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It used to be the practice in the Army for the reviewing authority to send back the record of a court martial and direct the court to make the sentence heavier. That practice has now been abolished by law, and I do not want to have any such practice resumed.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. The bill would not have that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### PAY OF NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE OFFICERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2723) to amend the pay readjustment act of 1942, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the eleventh paragraph of section 1 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607), approved June 16, 1942, is amended to read as follows:

"In computing the service for all pay purposes of officers paid under the provisions of this section, such officers shall be credited with full time for all periods during which they have held commissions as officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, or in the Organized Militia prior to July 1, 1916, or in the National Guard, or in the National Guard of the United States, or in the Officers' Reserve Corps, or in the Naval Militia, or in the National Naval Volunteers, or in the Naval Reserve Force, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve Force, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, or in the Philippine Scouts, or in the Philippine Constabulary, and service of Coast and Geodetic Survey officers authorized in section 2 (b) of the act of January 19, 1942 (Public Law 402, 77th Cong.): *Provided*, That for officers in service on June 30, 1922, there shall be included in the computation, in addition to the service set forth above, all service which was then counted in computing longevity pay, and service as a contract surgeon serving full time. Longevity pay for officers in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act shall be based on the total of all service in any or all of said services which is authorized to be counted for longevity pay purposes under the provisions of this act or as may otherwise be provided by law."

SEC. 2. The first paragraph of section 3 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607), approved June 16, 1942, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. When officers of the National Guard or of the Reserve Forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, including Reserve officers, are authorized by law to receive Federal pay, except armory drill and administrative function pay, they shall receive pay as provided in section 1 of this act, and in computing their service for pay they shall be credited with full time for all periods during which they have held commissions as officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, or in the Organized Militia prior to July 1, 1916, or in the National Guard, or in the National Guard of the United States, or in the Officers' Reserve Corps, or in the Naval Militia, or in the National Naval Volunteers, or in the Naval Reserve Force, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve Force, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, or in the Philippine Scouts, or in the Philippine Constabulary, and service authorized in section 2 (b) of the act of January 19, 1942 (Public Law 402, 77th Cong.)."

SEC. 3. This act shall become effective as of June 1, 1942, but no back pay or allowances for any period prior to such date shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. McKELLAR. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, this is a bill to correct the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942. In the passage of the bill it was the intention of the Congress to put the pay of Reserve officers and National Guard officers, insofar as longevity is concerned, on the same basis as that of Regular Army officers. After the enactment of the law, when it went to the Comptroller General he ruled that the language of the Pay Readjustment Act did not permit the Government to pay National Guard officers and Reserve officers on the same basis as Regular Army officers.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It was the understanding on the part of the whole Congress, at the time the pay bill was passed, that precisely what is provided for in the pending bill had been accomplished; was it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I recall that when the pay readjustment bill was in the Senate for consideration I raised with the Senator from Colorado the very subject matter covered by the pending bill, and the Senator from Colorado considered that the matter was covered by the language of the bill, and it was accepted by everyone in the Senate that it had been taken care of. In effect, the intention of the Congress has been reversed by the ruling of the Comptroller General, and this bill is simply to correct that ruling.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. When the pay readjustment bill was being considered, the Senator from Missouri did ask me the question to which he has referred, and I assured him that the matter was taken care of.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If we do not take some such action as that now proposed, we are likely to have a National Guard or Reserve colonel, let us say, in command of troops, and some major or captain from the Regular Army will be getting more pay than the colonel, his commanding officer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct; the Regular Army officer may be serving under the National Guard colonel, but the colonel will not be getting as much pay as his subordinate, merely because the superior officer is a National Guard or Reserve officer.

Mr. McKELLAR. The only effect will be to put Reserve officers and National Guard officers on an equality with the officers of the Regular Army?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct, insofar as longevity pay is concerned.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will that be the only effect of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That will be its only effect.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2804) to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask that this measure go over for further consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### PURCHASES OR SERVICES FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The bill (S. 2762) to except from the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes purchases or services rendered for the Department of Commerce where the amount involved does not exceed \$100, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) shall not be construed to apply to any purchase or service rendered for the Department of Commerce when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed the sum of \$100.

#### FLOOD CONTROL ON THE CONNECTICUT RIVER

The bill (S. 2623) authorizing the construction of certain public works in the basin of the Connecticut River for flood control was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the project for flood control in the Connecticut River Basin adopted by the act of June 23, 1938 (Public No. 761, 75th Cong.), and the act of August 18, 1941 (Public Law 228, 77th Cong.), is hereby modified to include and authorize the construction of the Guley Brook Conduit at Hartford, Conn., for flood control in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 804, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of \$420,000.

#### QUARTERS FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, when the calendar was called last week in my absence, Calendar No. 1641, Senate bill 2706, was passed over because no one was present to explain it. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill, and I shall be pleased to make a brief explanation of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2706) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), and "Title IV of the Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1941," approved September 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 883).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, two laws have been enacted providing defense housing for the Army and Navy. Both those acts restrict the rental of the houses to enlisted men or defense workers. The bill now pending would permit the renting of houses to officers of the Army and Marine Corps not above the grade of captain, and to officers of the Navy and Coast Guard not above the



grade of lieutenant, assigned to duty at naval or military reservations, posts, or bases, or to duty at defense industries.

In some instances houses are available for such rental purposes, but there are no appropriate quarters at the Army posts or naval bases for officers of the grades which I have indicated. The pending bill would amend the existing law so that the available quarters could be rented to minor officers.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2706) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), and "Title IV of the Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1941," approved September 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 883), was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the act entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), is hereby amended as follows: (a) title II, section 201, lines 7 and 8, strike out the parenthesis and the words "excluding officers" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and officers of the Army and Marine Corps not above the grade of captain, and officers of the Navy and Coast Guard, not above the grade of lieutenant"; (b) title II, section 202 (a), line 3, after the word "the" insert "officers."

Sec. 2. The third proviso under the caption "Navy Department" in title IV of the Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1941, approved September 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 883), is amended by inserting between the words "to" and "enlisted" in line 3 of the third proviso, the following: "officers of the Army and Marine Corps not above the grade of captain, and officers of the Navy and Coast Guard, not above the grade of lieutenant, with families, assigned to duty at naval or military reservations, posts, or bases, or to duty at defense industries, to" so that the third proviso as amended shall read: "Provided further, That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, at their discretion, are hereby authorized to rent such housing units, upon completion, to officers of the Army and Marine Corps not above the grade of captain, and officers of the Navy and Coast Guard, not above the grade of lieutenant, with families, assigned to duty at naval or military reservations, posts, or bases, or to duty at defense industries, to enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps with families, to field employees of the Military and Naval Establishments with families, and to workers with families who are engaged, or to be engaged, in industries essential to the military and naval national defense programs, including work on ships under the control of the Maritime Commission. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are further authorized to use such rentals as may be collected from each housing project for the management and maintenance of the housing units therein, including utilities, roads, walks, and accessories, and to set up special reserve accounts for the amortization of the cost of the project."

#### PENSIONS TO CERTAIN SELECTEES

**Mr. SCHWARTZ.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1623, Senate bill 1882, a bill granting pensions to persons who suffered injury or disease prior

LXXXVIII—484

to final induction in the Regular Army, Navy, or Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

The bill has the approval of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Veterans' Administration, as well as the Bureau of the Budget. It provides that after a selectee or soldier or other person comes within the control of the United States Government and is no longer a free agent, during his journey from his local board or other center to the place of final induction, he shall have the status of being in active military service.

**Mr. McKELLAR.** Would it give him the right of pension and other benefits?

**Mr. SCHWARTZ.** Yes; that is the very purpose of it.

**Mr. McKELLAR.** Although he had never been inducted into the Army?

**Mr. SCHWARTZ.** He may not have received final induction but has been directed by his local board to proceed to the point where final induction is to take place. He has no control over it. He is under the control of the United States Government, and the Secretary of War has said that a man in such a situation should be entitled to military status. The cost will not be great.

**Mr. McKELLAR.** I can see that the cost will be very great if many of the inductees are to be given such status, and there must be many of them who will be rejected before final induction.

**Mr. SCHWARTZ.** There are many men in good physical condition who do not have many dependents, but sometimes the local board authorities will put perhaps a hundred of those men on a train to be sent to an induction center, and something may occur to them en route.

**Mr. McKELLAR.** So far as any injury to them while they are in the service of the Government is concerned, I should be in favor of giving them every consideration.

**Mr. CLARK of Missouri.** The bill would provide for the protection of the selectee before he has been sworn into military service.

**Mr. McKELLAR.** That would be all right, of course. The Government should bear any loss sustained by the men, but to give them the status of soldiers when they have never been inducted into the Army, and to give them the benefit of retirement and pensions, and everything of that kind, would be putting a burden on the Government which I believe it should not be called upon to assume.

**Mr. CLARK of Missouri.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. SCHWARTZ.** I yield.

**Mr. CLARK of Missouri.** All the bill does is protect the soldier from the time he comes under the control of the draft board until he is sworn into service. If he should be killed in a train wreck before being inducted into the military service, he would be protected, under the provisions of the bill, whereas under existing law he would not be.

**Mr. McKELLAR.** That is all right, but it does not protect those who are rejected, does it?

**Mr. SCHWARTZ.** I read what the Secretary of War has said with regard to the proposed bill.

The Department believes there is good reason to provide such pensions for men who may suffer injury or disease, not due to misconduct, prior to their final entrance in the armed forces if they are in such status at the time of incurring the injury or disease that they have lost the power to decide whether or not they will enter such forces.

**Mr. McKELLAR.** If the bill merely provides for expenses or damages for injuries incurred while the men are under the orders of the United States Government, that is one thing; but when they may have been rejected, to put them on a status with soldiers who have been regularly inducted into the service seems to me to be unwise.

**Mr. CLARK of Missouri.** Suppose a selectee should be rejected because of some injury which might occur to him on the trip; should he not be compensated?

**Mr. McKELLAR.** If injury should befall him, that would be a different matter. However, I understand the bill to apply to all who are rejected, as well as to those who are in the military service, and I do not think it should so apply.

I hope the Senator will agree to the bill going over for another day. In the meantime, I will study it.

**Mr. SCHWARTZ.** I assure the Senator there are very few men who are not accepted after they have once passed the draft boards. I hope the bill will not go over. It has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, the War Department, and the Navy Department, as well as the Veterans' Administration.

**Mr. McKELLAR.** I have very grave doubt that the selectees should be given the character of status provided for in the bill.

**Mr. DANAHER.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. SCHWARTZ.** I yield.

**Mr. DANAHER.** I should like to ask the Senator whether the bill is to be only prospective in its operation, or is it to be retroactive and cover all veterans who come within the intendment of its language?

**Mr. SCHWARTZ.** I am sorry, but I did not quite understand the question of the Senator from Connecticut.

**Mr. DANAHER.** I should like to know what is the effective date of the proposed measure. Is it intended that it shall revert back to December 6, 1941, or April 7, 1917; or when is it to start?

**Mr. SCHWARTZ.** It will be effective as of the date of its passage, and will have no retroactive effect.

**Mr. DANAHER.** Suppose a soldier or an applicant for enrollment applied at an enlistment office downtown on March 1, 1942. Suppose the recruiting officer said, "You will have to go over to Fort Myer for a physical examination; there is a truck outside to take you and all the other applicants over to Fort Myer." Suppose on the way over an accident occurred and that particular applicant was injured. Is it the Senator's understanding that this particular bill would authorize a pension to such an applicant so injured on March 1, 1942?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. As of the date of the passage of the act; not prior. The final paragraph of the bill says:

*Provided, That payments of pension under the terms of this paragraph shall not be effective prior to the date of enactment of this amendment.*

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator, I think, has not as yet answered my question. Does the Senator mean that the particular applicant would be entitled to a pension so long as he lives, except for the period from March 1 to date?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. He would be entitled to a pension just as any other soldier who is injured while he is in military service, or while under the control and command of the Army and has no choice of his own.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator answer another question? Suppose that a particular applicant who sought enlistment in the service in 1925 was injured on his way for his physical examination. Would this particular bill authorize such an injured applicant to receive a pension from now on?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. It would not.

Mr. DANAHER. It would not. And wherein does the Senator find it does not in the language before us?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I will read it:

For the purposes of paragraph I hereof, as amended, any person who has applied or shall hereafter apply for enlistment or enrollment in the active military or naval forces and who was or shall be provisionally accepted—

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator please permit an interruption at that point? In line 15, on page 2, what is meant by the words "and who was or shall be provisionally accepted"? Do they make it apply to the future?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, I have no objection to striking out those words.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator has no objection to striking out those words?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. No. I understand the Senator proposes to strike out the words "was or."

Mr. DANAHER. Does the Senator think those words ought to go out?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I am content to have them go out if the Senator from Connecticut so desires.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me point out to the Senator again in line 17 that the bill goes on to say:

Or who was or is selected for service.

Would the Senator say that the words "who was selected for service" would apply to a draftee in the first World War?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. No; a man in the first World War is covered by other provisions of existing law.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the Senator say that the words "who was selected for service" would apply to an applicant for enlistment, let us say, on February 1, 1942.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes; I think they would.

Mr. DANAHER. But would they not apply to an applicant for enlistment on February 1, 1925? Wherein does the Senator find anything which differentiates the class of cases of those applicants who will be benefited by this measure in

the present war as distinguished from anything that occurred before December 6, or 7, or 8, 1941?

Mr. President, the questions which I have raised are not, let me say to the Senator from Wyoming, to be taken as indicating objections to this measure. It is my belief that they are legitimate questions, obvious questions, which will naturally arise in any effort to administer the act. It seems to me that if we are going to make the measure effective at all for the future it ought to date back to December 8, 1941. If we are going to make it apply to the applicant for enlistment tomorrow, it ought to apply to the applicant for enlistment a year ago. Because the bill is indefinite, because it fails of so much of its purpose, Mr. President, as it seems to me it should reach, I shall object to its present consideration.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Let us pass it over.

Mr. DANAHER. I suggest that it go over so that the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Tennessee and others of us may have a day or so to examine it and try to bring ourselves into common accord. I think we can do it.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I was going to say that we might pass it over temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### AMENDMENT OF ACT TO PREVENT PERNICIOUS POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate bill 1968, Calendar No. 965.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, some weeks ago, when request was made for consideration of the bill—and I speak now wholly from memory—at the request of one or more Members of the Senate I made objection to its then present consideration. I do not remember who they were. If they are here now they can speak for themselves. If they are absent, they should be here. I shall make no objection now, but I wish to say that I did make the objection previously at the request of one or more Members of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. I am quite sure the Senator from Oregon so stated at the time.

Mr. McNARY. Yes; I think I did. I have asked two or three Members now present if any of them requested that I make objection at that time, and they have said no. There must be a final disposition of bills on the calendar, and I do not propose to hold up legislation from time to time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the present consideration of the measure, will the Senator from New Mexico make a brief explanation of the bill, inasmuch as I take it, if it is taken up, possibly it will not be considered under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. HATCH. Yes; I think it will be.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is asking that we return to that bill on the calendar?

Mr. HATCH. Yes. I shall be glad to explain it.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator please explain it before it is taken up for consideration?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the measure has been on the calendar since last

December. This matter was first called to my attention, speaking frankly, by certain women of the National Democratic Committee, who publish what they call the Democratic Digest. They sell that publication, I think, for a dollar a year. I think the proceeds from it go to the national committee. There is a provision in the act which Congress passed some time ago, which I myself drafted, and which I supported, and I still support, which makes it—

unlawful for any person, individual, partnership—

And so forth—

to purchase or buy any goods, commodities, advertising, \* \* \* where the proceeds of such a purchase \* \* \* shall directly or indirectly inure to the benefit of or for any candidate for an elective Federal office—

Or for a political party.

The ladies who are publishing the Democratic Digest, the proceeds from which go to the national committee, are fearful that in so doing they are violating that provision of the act. So this amendment was drafted, and I have construed it to mean, and I think it means exactly what it says, which is:

That nothing in this act shall be construed to interfere with or prevent the publication or sale, by any political committee or other political organization, of any periodical publication not published and sold for profit which is sold at a price not substantially in excess of the cost of its publication.

I thought that was a reasonable provision, and I consented.

Mr. TAFT. What is the effect of it on advertising? Suppose large advertising space is sold in the publication?

Mr. HATCH. This amendment does not change the provision of the original act in that respect. I am certain of that.

Mr. TAFT. It does not, for instance, authorize the publication of the book which is often referred to, the one published by the Democratic National Committee and sold for large sums of money to various corporations?

Mr. HATCH. Of course, the Senator knows that that is the reason why I inserted a provision in respect to such matters in the original act. If I thought the proposed amendment would weaken that provision, I should certainly not be in favor of this measure.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is confident that the proposed amendment will not weaken that act?

Mr. HATCH. I am confident it will not weaken it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Would it affect in any way the limitations upon the amounts which may be spent for publicity?

Mr. HATCH. No; not at all.

Mr. WHITE. It would not affect that matter in any way?

Mr. HATCH. No; not at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1968) to amend section 13 (c) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2,



1939, as amended, so as to permit the sale of certain publications not published or sold for profit, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 13 (c) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "Provided further, That nothing in this act shall be construed to interfere with or prevent the publication or sale, by any political committee or other political organization, of any periodical publication not published and sold for profit which is sold at a price not substantially in excess of the cost of its publication; and nothing in this act shall be construed to prohibit the purchase or buying of any such publication when sold at such a price".

#### CLAIMS IN CONNECTION WITH FAILURE OF BIG PORCUPINE DAM, FORT PECK IRRIGATION PROJECT, MONTANA

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 973, Senate bill 1869. I ask for immediate consideration of the bill. The bill was reached on the calendar some time ago in my absence and was passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1869) for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered property losses as a result of the failure of the Big Porcupine Dam on the Fort Peck project, Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, in section 1, on page 3, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "\$1,903.98" and insert "\$1,903.98; and Wallace Levandoski and Dorothy Levandoski, \$364", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the claimants hereinafter named the sums hereinafter specified, in full satisfaction of their respective claims against the United States for compensation for property losses or damages sustained by them as a result of the failure of the Big Porcupine Dam on the Fort Peck project, Montana: Nashua Booster Club, \$700; Walter Collins, \$345.80; Martin Kaminiski, \$150; Susie Innat, \$280; Edmond N. Golphenec, \$300; Alexander Hamilton, \$183.50; Edward T. Blue, \$345; Charles H. Brocksmith, \$229.10; Rose L. Brocksmith, \$1,212.15; Norman Brocksmith, \$191.60; Emma Collins, \$1,499.48; Andrew Levandoski and Tom Levandiski, \$6,000; Joe Innat, \$670; John Etchart, \$6,350; Floyd DeLay, \$1,000; Zetta Michel, \$800; Theodore Aaberg, \$144.40; Lawrence Alvin, \$137; Lawrence Benson, \$45; Tony Bengochea, \$250; James Keil, \$120; George Kugler, \$58.50; Walter Kusek, \$278; Jetta Lebert, \$89; Alfred Lee, \$218.80; Lutheran Church, \$102; Dean B. McKee, \$221; Sadie McPherson, \$170.50; John B. Martin, \$48; E. A. Meek, \$37; Anna Michel, \$525; Martin Milsten, \$127.75; Myrtle Olson, \$102; Dick Opland, \$388; L. M. Ormseth, \$120; Nels Peterson, \$169.08; H. Merle Priest, \$110; Robert Rawe, \$95.90; Della Sevier, \$106; H. H. Bissell, \$67.75; Will Bohne, \$37; Margaret

Camburn, \$84.75; Fred Desonia, \$58.10; Dora K. Dykstra, \$100; Adolph Ellingson, \$28; George Fisher, \$40; Robert Glunz, \$85; Marvel Hammond, \$156.50; Elmer Hauger, \$647; Mabel Hinerman, \$89; J. D. Irwin, \$182.05; Peter James, \$66; Luther Johnson, \$65; Elizabeth Skugrud, \$52; Ruth Smith, \$281; Webb Southerland, \$116; Myrtle Stenbakken, \$238; John Storkson, \$175; Minnie Sunkel, \$453; Arthur C. Swanson, \$113; M. Thista, \$310; John A. Wigdahl, \$41; Great Northern Railway Co., \$1,903.98; and Wallace Levandoski and Dorothy Levandoski, \$364.

SEC. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in this act for payment to any claimant in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim of such claimant, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### PROGRAM AS TO BILLS ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think I ought to observe that immediately after the tax bill is disposed of, if possible, I think it would be fair to begin at the beginning of the calendar and go through it for the disposition of bills which have been on the calendar for a number of months. Ample notice will be given, so that Senators who object to bills or who are interested in their passage may be present. At an early date I wish to have the complete calendar called so that we may dispose of bills to which there is no objection.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Cleora Hila Creed to be postmaster at Turon, Kans., in place of P. E. Tubbs, removed.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Brig. Gen. Julian C. Smith and Brig. Gen. Charles D. Barrett to be major generals in the Marine Corps for temporary service from August 26, 1942; and

Sundry citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the

clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

#### THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 2, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 1, 1942:

##### UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following named surgeons to be senior surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the dates set opposite their names:

Guy H. Faget, September 19, 1942.

Estella Ford Warner, October 5, 1942.

##### APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

##### TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Maj. Kenneth Gilpin Hoge, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1940.

##### TO INFANTRY

Maj. Charles Carlton Cavender, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel), with rank from July 1, 1940.

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonel with rank from September 17, 1942

Lt. Col. Carl Spaatz, Air Corps (temporary major general).

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from October 4, 1942

Maj. Carlyle Howe Ridenour, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Bennett Edward Meyers, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Maj. George Mitchell Grimes, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Edward Bethel Jackson, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Paul Hyde Prentiss, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Warren Arthur Maxwell, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. William Henry Papenfoth, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Frederick Mercer Hopkins, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Walter Leo Weible, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Rupert Edison Starr, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Leonard Dickson Weddington, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. John Henry Doherty, Finance Department (temporary colonel).

*To be lieutenant colonel with rank from October 20, 1942*

Maj. Edward Michael Powers, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Maurice Edgar Jennings, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary colonel).

*To be lieutenant colonel with rank from October 28, 1942*

Maj. Howell Harrell, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

*To be lieutenant colonel with rank from October 28, 1942*

Maj. Paul Edmund Burrows, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

#### MEDICAL CORPS

##### *To be majors*

Capt. Edward James Kendricks, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 1, 1942.

Capt. Oliver Harold Waltrip, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from October 1, 1942.

##### *To be captains*

First Lt. Maurice Riordan Connolly, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 1, 1942.

First Lt. Joseph Nagle, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 5, 1942.

First Lt. Harry Louis Berman, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 11, 1942.

First Lt. Isaiah Alonzo Wiles, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 11, 1942.

First Lt. William Blackford Look, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from October 18, 1942.

First Lt. Charles Ellison Melcher, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 25, 1942.

#### DENTAL CORPS

##### *To be colonels*

Lt. Col. Oscar Peter Snyder, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 27, 1942.

Lt. Col. Rex McKinley McDowell, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 27, 1942.

Lt. Col. Charles Melville Taylor, Dental Corps, with rank from October 27, 1942.

Lt. Col. Thomas Lovet Smith, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 27, 1942.

Lt. Col. George Ray Tressel, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 27, 1942.

Lt. Col. Frederic Harold Bockoven, Dental Corps, with rank from October 27, 1942.

##### *To be major*

Capt. Wallace Jacob Morlock, Dental Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from October 15, 1942.

#### CHAPLAINS

##### *To be colonel*

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Ora Jason Cohee, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1942.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, October 1, 1942:

##### IN THE ARMY

##### APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The nominations of Athel Bangert et al. for appointment in the Regular Army.

(NOTE.—A full list of the names of the persons whose nominations for appointment

in the Regular Army were confirmed today may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 28, 1942, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on p. 7535 with the name of Athel Bangert and ending on p. 7536, with the name of Louis Axelrod.)

#### POSTMASTERS

##### NEW JERSEY

Ernest F. Rohn, Arlington.

Hiram S. McKeen, Avalon.

Frank Tilton, Avon by the Sea.

John P. Euler, Belford.

Louis J. Bowlby, Bound Brook.

Richard P. Hughes, Burlington.

Benjamin J. Haulboskey, Leonardo.

John J. Quinn, Perth Amboy.

Adolph F. Schmitt, Sayreville.

Patrick J. Shortt, Wildwood.

##### TEXAS

Nat Shick, Big Spring.

Joseph Y. Fraser, Colorado City.

Thomas A. Key, Desdemona.

Stephen S. Perry, Freeport.

William E. Porter, Glen Rose.

Lucie Hill, Hull.

Morris Ferrell, Krum.

William M. Covey, Mabank.

Harry S. Merts, McAllen.

Perry Hartgraves, Menard.

Myrtle M. Hatch, Mission.

Claude F. Norman, Rule.

Carl R. Nall, Sherman.

Charles H. Grounds, Talpa.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and merciful Father, renew in us a deeper sense of Thy presence. We thank Thee that Thou hast endowed us with the power of thought, faith, and hope and pray that Christian morality may be founded on the undying law of human brotherhood. Let us learn that it is ever more better to give than to receive; teach us to serve more freely and gladly, reflecting the heavenly spirit of Him who gave Himself that we might live in the light of an enlarged manhood. Within the infinitude of His mercy we would feel the lordship of the Master, whose knightly soul, with its regal goodness, the angels evermore praise and adore.

Grant that we may ever have formed within us such a spirit of the divine that living shall be a holy privilege and brave, with an unearthly assurance. As the souls of men are being torn away on the fields of conflict, give to all mothers and daughters, fathers, and sons, Thy perpetual care. May they walk in the midst of their anxieties and heartaches learning the royal lesson of suffering. When the burdens seem too heavy to bear and the hands are tired and weary, oh come to them in the stillness of Thy sweet peace, even as the night enwraps the hills and as the shepherd folds his flock. Bless them with that rest which the world cannot give and they shall go on forever wondering at love's inexhaustible fullness—through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 346. Joint resolution extending for 2 months the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under the acts of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205), and June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 241).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7565. An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WAGNER, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. DANAHY, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government", for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Interior.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of War.
4. The National Archives.
5. National Housing Agency.
6. Securities and Exchange Commission.

#### THE STATE OF THE NATION

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully address myself, if I may, to every Member of the House, regretting that we do not have a full attendance, not on account of anything I may be able to originate, but because I am calling to your attention a speech delivered last night over the radio by one of our Members, which deserves its place with the speeches and papers of Patrick Henry, George Washington, and Thomas Jefferson. I refer to a grand speech, a noble speech, a sublime speech, made at an opportune time, impelled, I am fully persuaded, by his recognition of his own obligation to his country above everything else. I hope you heard the speech of the gentleman from New York, Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, delivered last night over the radio. In the speech there is no attempt at oratorical display. Its eloquence lies in its truth and power.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks and include therein the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].



The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

The speech referred to is as follows:

It must be apparent to every thoughtful person—and more and more Americans are becoming thoughtful these days—that we are in for a long, grueling contest. We have placed our feet upon the lower slopes, down near the bottom, of a high hill. We must climb to the top before we can see victory. Every step of the way will be difficult. Indeed, we may be pushed back occasionally, but we shall keep on climbing. We have been in this war almost 9 months, and, to be frank about it, we haven't climbed very far. Most of our efforts have been devoted to preparing for the climb. As a part of that preparation we have engaged in some military operations which, generally speaking, are more defensive in character than offensive. We are sending air corps personnel and planes and special repair troops to Egypt, to Persia, to India, and even to China, to help our allies defend those countries against German or Japanese attack. In none of them have we seized the offensive as yet. We have sent troops of several categories to northern Ireland and to England, first to bolster the defense, and to take part later in an offensive when such a thing shall be deemed wise. We have conducted a brilliant operation in the Solomon Islands. It may be called a minor offensive, but its major purpose was to seize those islands and from them defend our line of communication to Australia. And we have reinforced Australia herself, primarily to defend, for the moment, that continent, and preserve it to us and our Allies as a jumping-off place from which to launch an offensive against the Japanese later on in the southwest Pacific. We are growing stronger every day in men and material. There can be no doubt about that. But we must continue to grow, else we cannot climb the hill. Despite some disappointments here and there, despite some confusion, our munitions program is moving ahead toward ever larger dimensions. The same may be said of our shipbuilding program, both of naval vessels and cargo vessels. As for the ship program, we have not yet secured the safe control of all the seas. That, alone, is an enormous undertaking, but we must succeed, cost what it may in time and effort.

Coming to a consideration of the actual manpower in our military services, that, too, must be increased. Just how many men we must have finally in our Army and Navy I am not prepared to say. Perhaps there is no one who can give a definite and final judgment on such a thing. The strength of the military services will be determined from time to time by the necessities of the war. But already it is apparent that both services are destined to grow far beyond their present limits, and the exceedingly serious question arises as to how we shall recruit them. As we build them up we want to make them just as efficient as we can, and at the same time keep the economic life of the country in as healthy a condition as possible. We must always bear in mind that it is exceedingly important to balance our effort as between industry, agriculture, and transportation on the one hand and the military services upon the other. The latter cannot fight with anything like maximum efficiency without the efficient support of the former. So as the Army and the Navy grow in numbers we should see to it that the growth is healthy from the standpoint of the united effort.

Coming to a consideration of the Army, which in point of numbers is by far the larger of our military services, we will be confronted with a serious problem within 6 or 7 months. By the end of this calendar year we shall have something more than 4,000,000 men in our Army—considerably more if the present program of recruitment proceeds. By far

the larger number of our soldiers is obtained through the operations of the selective-service law. That law provides that all men between 20 years and 45 years of age shall be liable for military service. The law, elaborated by regulations, also provides in effect that before men with dependents—notably married men—are inducted into the service, the local boards shall call up men without dependents, mostly single men, and that when the supply of single men approaches exhaustion the draft boards shall commence calling in married men in the order of their respective domestic obligations, those with the lightest obligations coming first, followed by those with heavier obligations, until we reach the man with a wife and several children all actually dependent upon him.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the Army is calling for more and more men, and that before the end of this year many draft boards, in order to fill their quotas, must reclassify a considerable number of married men into class I-A and induct them into the service. The plain fact is that we are faced with the prospect of drawing more and more married men into the Army. This means a constantly growing dislocation of the domestic and economic life of the country. It also means that the average age of the soldier yet to be recruited will increase from time to time, for obviously the married man, generally speaking, is older than the single man. Already this increase in the average age of the Army is becoming apparent. Men in their middle thirties, and even in their early forties, are coming in. This is especially true in some of the divisions and other units which have been formed during this last summer and which are composed quite largely of recent recruits. It is a fact that competent military observers who have seen these new troops have noted that the men appear to be somewhat older than the men in the thoroughly trained divisions which were organized 18 months or more ago. In other words, the average age has commenced to go up, and it will continue going up so long as the law remains as it is. No one of us will cast any aspersion upon the character and patriotism and the courage of men of 35 or 40 years of age. They will do their level best and will make great sacrifices. But through no fault of their own they do not make the best soldiers. They leave dependent families at home, dependent upon allotments taken in part from the pay of the soldier himself and in part from the Federal Treasury. They leave, in many instances, business obligations, perhaps a mortgaged home, perhaps a little business which may go to pieces during their absence. Quite naturally they are apt to worry about those things. It is pretty tough on the soldier to have to worry about what is going on at home. Here we have a combination of the domestic, the economic, and the sentimental, all operating against that soldier's peace of mind.

But there is another and much more important thing to consider, especially when we estimate the military efficiency of the Army as a whole. It is this: Men in their thirties and early forties, with very rare exceptions, cannot endure the terrific physical and nervous strain of long campaigns nearly as well as younger men—men, we will say, 10 or 15 years younger. In muscular development they may be strong; they may be able to lift heavy weights. But when it comes to living under the terrible conditions imposed by desperate war most of them are apt to break down. They can't help it, try as they may. By contrast, men between the ages of 18 and 25, we will say, the group whom we denominate as youth, make the better and more enduring soldiers. Very few of them have in the back of their minds the worries of the older men. But more important still, they possess a certain marvelous resiliency which enables them

to stand up under heavy punishment through long campaigns. I have yet to meet a veteran Army officer, in or out of the War Department, who does not testify to the amazing qualities of endurance exhibited by youthful soldiers, to their ability to learn quickly, to their ingenuity, to their daring. I have yet to meet a veteran combat officer who does not hope for a liberal sprinkling of youth in his unit. Those youths, steadied by the presence and example of some older men, sergeants and corporals, contribute not only endurance but punch. All history shows that great wars have been won by youth. For example, some people are amazed to find out that the Union Army in 1865, at the time of Appomattox, averaged but 19 years and 6 months of age. The Confederate Army was a little younger. This in turn means, of course, that thousands upon thousands of these soldiers were less than 19 years of age. Would we say that the men who fought under Grant and Lee were not good soldiers? Indeed, it was youth that survived in both armies. Most of the older men had dropped out before the war came to an end. Nor can it be said that the experience of the youngsters in those two armies brutalized them or made them unfit to be good citizens after the war was over, for the fact is that the veterans of both armies proved later to be the very best of citizens. And so as we look ahead to the strains which we shall endure in the war in which we are now engaged, as we look ahead to the intensity of the struggle, lasting, it may be, for several years, can we escape the conclusion that it were wise to introduce more of youth into our Army—yes, men of 18 and 19 years of age?

From their standpoint and from the standpoint of the country it is not wise for us to see to it that these young men get long and thorough training before our participation in this war reaches a maximum of intensity? Fortunately, the policy of the War Department with respect to training is sound. Unless some terrible military crisis overtakes us we are not going to make the mistake we have so often made before—sending untrained men into action. We are giving, and we shall continue to give, all our recruits thorough basic training before they are assigned to a unit. And then after they are assigned and become members, as it were, of a team, their training continues literally for months, to the end that they shall be thoroughly seasoned physically, taught how to take care of themselves, taught to understand their responsibilities, the necessity for adequate discipline, how to obey the signals, and how to reach their objectives with a minimum loss of life. And it is generally conceded that it takes just about one whole year, perhaps a little more, to form, equip, and train a division. Once hardened and instructed, these youngsters, inducted originally after they have passed the age of 18 years, will make the very best kind of soldiers. They will bring into the Army the aggressive spirit of youth; they will endure, and grow stronger as they endure. The Army as a whole will be more efficient for their presence and we shall win the war the more quickly.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an article by John T. Flynn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] may be allowed to speak for 10 minutes after the legislative

program of the day and any other orders that have heretofore been entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### THE TAX BILL

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is good news to the country that the too-long-delayed tax bill will be taken up very soon in the other body. Every indication points to its early passage by the Senate and its prompt enactment as recently urged by the President.

There have been rumors that final action would not be taken on the measure until after November 3.

As ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee, I want to say that I am definitely opposed to any such delay. This bill was initiated on March 3, and no matter how important nor intricate its provisions, ample time has elapsed for its thorough consideration.

It is much more important to the taxpayers of the country to have some definite idea of their future tax liability than to delay the bill for political reasons.

I shall use my utmost influence to send the tax bill to conference immediately it passes the Senate and have the conferees report back to their respective Houses as expeditiously as possible.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record on the necessity of further economy in nonmilitary expenditures.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter I received from Miss Willie A. Lawson, executive secretary of the Arkansas Education Association, and from Mr. Forrest Razzell, field secretary of the Arkansas Education Association, in regard to the need for Federal aid to the public schools of the country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BURCH was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record by printing a message sent by me to the Seventh Georgia District Democratic Convention.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I received unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a speech given by a distinguished newspaper publisher of Roch-

ester, N. Y. Because of unpredictable events I was unable to revise and extend my remarks yesterday, and I therefore ask that privilege today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOFFMAN was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter which I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record in connection with two separate subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include certain excerpts from a letter from a constituent of mine.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein excerpts from a speech delivered by Hon. John J. Parer, judge of the fourth circuit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therewith a very splendid address by the educational consultant of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Dr. Duane Orton.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### LOCAL RATIONING BOARDS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the main job the Office of Price Administration has to do is the job of public relations. It is the job of trying to help the American people to understand what the program of price control is for and above all why rationing is being used, what its real aims and purposes are and how it can be fairly administered and used to bring greater, not less, gen-

eral justice. Under these circumstances I submit that it is exactly the wrong thing to do to abolish a lot of local rationing boards as is being done at present. These boards have been composed of people who volunteered their services and have faithfully tried to get this program started and to explain it to their neighbors and fellow townspeople. The excuse I have been given for this action is that there is not money enough, that O. P. A. must reduce the number of boards in order to save money. Therefore I most earnestly suggest that the Appropriations Committee find out from the Office of Price Administration how much money they think they are going to save by doing this. I know of local rationing boards where the local communities stand ready to bear all the expense of the rationing board with the possible exception of the salary of the clerk. I think Congress should be informed fully on this whole matter. For the only saving element among a democratic people in connection with an over-all governmental control over their lives such as this war necessitates is to be found in entrusting the basic administration of these programs to as many of the people themselves as possible. The closer to the people these rationing boards can be the better.

Moreover, it is exceedingly hard for people to understand why they should be compelled to travel much longer distances to the rationing boards at the very moment that they are being urged to conserve the rubber on their automobiles and when rationing of automobile use on a Nation-wide basis lies immediately ahead.

The local rationing boards ought to be restored. If O. P. A. really has not enough money to do it I for one am willing to vote them enough so they can do it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a poem which appeared in the Star News of Eldon, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### WARTIME CENSORSHIP AND FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, National Newspaper Week is being observed from October 1 to 8, with expressions of confidence in the Nation's press, as well as commendation for the vital contribution being made by it. Under the stress of wartime, it is only natural that our newspapers are criticized because of their handling of news directly connected with war developments. Much news is withheld, while other articles are deferred, in complete variance with established policies. It is not generally known that such practices are the result of wartime censorship with regulations that must be rigidly adhered to, in the interest of national defense and security.



The newspapers have done a splendid job of striking a balance between the conflicting public demands of handling news, declared Byron Price, Federal Director of Censorship, although he pointed out the need of explaining why some information has to be withheld. He stressed that the basic consideration behind censorship was—

that none of us shall provide the enemy, by design or inadvertence, with information that will help him kill Americans.

The press of America has fought to preserve public morale and to inspire in our armed forces the confidence without which there can be no victory, declared Walter M. Dear, president of the American Newspaper Publishers Association. He then added:

Our willingness to go all out for victory does not mean that we surrender the right of a free press to condemn and criticize where we consider the circumstances justified. Nor can we quiescently tolerate infringement of individual rights, seeking, under the subterfuge of war necessity, to create in the future what always has been abhorrent to our American way of life.

Ten thousand daily and weekly newspapers are unselfishly serving the Nation in this critical era, notwithstanding serious economic factors which have adversely affected their financial structure. Priority restrictions and rationing regulations have materially curtailed advertising volume, and the acute labor situation has made the publishing business most difficult and hazardous. However, these newspapers respond patriotically to every call for service, and they will continue to justify the confidence and respect which they command.

Freedom of the press is a sacred right, without which there can be no free government. Although they are being called upon to meet abnormal wartime demands, and to make great sacrifices, American newspapers will measure up to the highest traditions. The fourth estate will meet every challenge in this hour of grave national peril.

#### THE NATIONAL SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a speech delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKEOUGH].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago an outstanding Member from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] addressed the House calling attention to a radio address by the distinguished Member from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] stating:

I am calling your attention to a speech delivered over the radio last night by the Honorable JAMES W. WADSWORTH which deserves its place with the speeches and papers of Patrick Henry, George Washington, and Thomas Jefferson.

He further stated:

I refer to a grand speech, a noble speech, a sublime speech, made at an opportune time,

impelled, I am fully persuaded, by his recognition of his own obligation to his country above everything else.

In that connection Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert as part of my remarks a speech delivered by our colleague, the Honorable RAYMOND S. McKEOUGH, of Illinois, at a Democratic convention in Springfield, Ill., the scene of some of the famous Lincoln-Douglas debates. The appraisal of the gentleman from North Carolina of Representative WADSWORTH's radio address will apply with equal strength to the timely speech delivered by Representative McKEOUGH, whose ability as a speaker, yes, as a really profound orator, is well known to us. His speech again confirms and emphasizes his ardent loyalty to President Roosevelt and the cause of the common people as well as his heartfelt, unselfish interest in the welfare of our country. I know that nearly all of us regret that the House will soon be deprived by promotion of his much-needed usefulness, but our loss will be the Senate's gain, because he is no longer a candidate for reelection to the House but is a candidate for election to the United States Senate, a nomination which he reluctantly accepted after a very large number of representative and patriotic citizens of both parties loudly proclaimed that he was the most ideal candidate in this critical period of our national life. In view of the obstructive and unenviable record of his opponent, I am confident of his election. In him, we all know, the President and the country will have an exceptionally able and fearless Senator.

Mr. Speaker, Representative McKEOUGH's speech, which I have been granted permission to include in my remarks, is as follows:

Fellow Americans, as you perhaps know, I come to this convention directly from our Nation's Capital.

When I have completed delivery of this address, I shall have to return immediately to Washington and to my duties as a Member of Congress.

It had been my intention to spend the remainder of this month in a tour of the State. The Democratic State Central Committee has arranged an itinerary which was to have taken me into many down-State communities.

Needless to say, I regret exceedingly that I shall be unable, at least before October 1, to join the caravan. But my associates will ably carry on—and our campaign will be made.

Matters of the greatest moment to the success of the war effort will engage me in Washington, and I could not in conscience absent myself from the meetings of Congress. In times such as these, the individual interests of all of us—whatever our station or occupation—must be sacrificed to the Nation's welfare.

The immemorial customs governing occasions such as this inspiring gathering of Democratic men and women from all parts of Illinois, in times of peace assign to the candidate for United States Senator the duty of striking the keynote for the fall campaign.

But we are a nation at war.

The clarion call for the contest upon which we are entering must simulate the battle summons which is being heard by our fighting men upon all the far-flung fronts of the world conflict which engages the United Nations.

The keynote to which we must be attuned until the November 3 election, and for the duration of the war, is not, therefore, solely one of my devising.

It is an echo of the piercing call to battle stations first heard at Pearl Harbor on the morning of December 7, 1941, when the Japanese attacked our naval outpost in the Pacific and precipitated this Nation into the second World War.

Even before that date the character of this campaign was plainly indicated.

It was to be, and is, a referendum upon the proposition that political partisanship be set aside for patriotism.

It was to be, and is, a plebiscite to test the loyalty of the civilian command to the constitutional Commander in Chief of our armed forces.

It was to be, and is, a test of freemen's preferences as between two kinds of public servants in the Congress. On the one hand are those who served party before country. On the other are those who braved the highly organized pressures of the obstructionists' era of dalliance. These supported the statesmanlike program of preparedness laid down by the courageous, the nonappeasing, the far-seeing, the surpassingly gallant President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

This was to be, and is, a campaign in which the issue is crystal clear for all who are not blinded by partisan hates and prejudices. The issue is:

Shall we follow Roosevelt, or submit to slavery under Hitler?

Fully cognizant of the debt of gratitude under which your allegiance places me, acutely aware of your justifiable pride in the party achievements of the past, I am nonetheless wholly confident that the great majority of those in this convention have already recognized that the national necessity must supersede petty politics.

Of the Democratic men and women assembled here I ask:

Forget that you are Democrats. Adjourn politics. Black out partisanship. Before you are anything else, be Americans. Be patriots.

This is not a fight to save the Democratic Party. This is not a contest to win a corner on patronage. It is not a struggle to exalt personalities. These are puny things beside the stake for which we are contending as Americans.

Our goal is the salvation of civilization itself. Our objective is the preservation of the American way of life—of the "four freedoms."

I know that I require no by-your-leave to submerge my own partisanship to the service of these lofty aims.

And you know that I don't have to get the permission of Colonel McCormick and the Chicago Tribune to talk, act, and think patriotically.

As an American citizen I would flout every concept of Jeffersonian Democracy if to do so would contribute to the defeat of the Hitlerian philosophy of government by force, and insure an enduring peace for the world.

Not so long ago those who would seemingly rather see Hitler and the Axis win the war than support this Nation's leader predicted there would be no elections in Illinois and America this fall.

This very convention is a refutation of that lie, which ascribed to President Roosevelt an ambition to become dictator over the 130,000,000 free men and women who populate this republic.

But if this convention were never held, the falsehood would have been very effectively nailed in this very city some weeks ago. And by whom? By those self-styled leaders of the opposition who first uttered it.

For they were here, calling themselves the spokesmen for the Republican voters of Illinois and studiously avoiding any reference, complimentary or otherwise, to the true patriot who is the titular head of their party—Wendell Willkie.

From Michigan Avenue and the river in Chicago to the meeting hall in Springfield—even casting a pall over the tomb of the Great Emancipator—the forbidding shadow of the Tribune Tower stretched halfway across the State to lay upon the so-called Republican convention. And the little men with little minds were palsied and afraid.

Afraid of what?

That is a question I cannot answer. There is nothing about the Tribune Tower, from its flying buttresses to the basement, that frightens RAY MCKEUGH. Or ever did. Or ever will.

All I know is that those who masqueraded as leaders were afraid for their political lives to break away from the stultifying strategy of defeatism imposed upon them by the unbridled bitterness of the No. 1 Roosevelt-hater of them all—McCormick of the Tribune.

Under those hopeless circumstances, the product of the convention's deliberations was as meaningless from the standpoint of promoting unity, as might have been expected.

Think of it: These traducers of Wendell Willkie needed 6 weeks of consultation before they felt justified in proclaiming themselves American enough to want to win the war.

Any citizen of Illinois, any citizen of the Nation, who doesn't want to win the war against the Axis is plainly treasonous.

Any political group, however misrepresentative of the hopes, the aspirations, the ideals of the community that seeks to escape responsibility for blueprinting the period of reconstruction, is neither wise, just, nor humane.

Just as important as winning the war is winning of the peace.

Not to commit ourselves now to development of ways and means for preventing future wars is to repeat all of the tragic, the inexcusable blunders of the past.

It is to deprive our boys in this war of what may well be their greatest incentive to fight—the knowledge that the sacrifices they are making will not be in vain.

It is to rob future generations of the most priceless heritage we can hand down to them—a just and enduring peace.

Yes; the character of this campaign was clearly defined many months ago. It was inconceivable that those who employed every technique they knew to obstruct the policies of the Commander in Chief would alter their course.

Theirs is a partisan blindness which only their repudiation on November 3 can cure.

Their addiction to error has become habitual. And so it is that history repeats itself. Their conduct identifies them unmistakably with that group of willful little men—the Borahs, the Lodges, the McCormicks, the Reeds, and Johnsons to whose sabotage of the immortal Wilson's League of Nations plan we owe this most cruel of all wars.

I am of the conviction that in this age of transport and communication America can no longer live alone.

Ours is an enlightened electorate. The voters do not make the same mistakes twice.

It is an aid to voters that obstructionism has not chosen to posture in false whiskers for this campaign.

They are going to try to brazen it through. They think that through misrepresentation of the President's motives, distortion of the true facts by their partisan press, and with appeals to prejudice, to passion, and to provincialism, they can make Roosevelt the sacrificial victim of the follies which are theirs alone, as their predecessors crucified Wilson.

But it is not Roosevelt who is on trial in this campaign. It is the Roosevelt haters.

Who opposes candidates pledged to uphold his hands?

They are the same forces of reaction we have bested in many a skirmish in the decade preceding the present titanic conflict which engulfs the United Nations.

They are the stupid, the confused, the duped. They are the persistently partisan-minded who would gamble with the future of democracy itself to win an election they said would never be held.

With them goes the fifth column in this country, for there is no place within our ranks for enemies of the Republic.

I have told you what their strategy is. I need not tell you that what we have to defeat is defeatism itself.

We have to annihilate doubt. We must dispel disunity and the despair they will seek to spread through whisperings and with editorials carefully proofread to fall just short of seditious utterance.

They will try to magnify the mistakes that must creep into so great an undertaking as the conduct of this war.

They will endeavor to disqualify competency, they will seek even to impeach integrity.

You remember what happened when war was declared upon this country by the Axis partners.

For a day or two the obstructionists did an apparently sincere about-face.

But their hatchets were never actually buried. They were merely hidden in the folds of the flag which they hastily wrapped around themselves while declaring hypocritically they would support their country's leader, right or wrong.

They may be interested in "keeping 'em flying" but they have kept on lying about Roosevelt.

You and I know them for what they are, and rejoice that they are not of us.

We can rejoice much more heartily in the strength of our own company.

Who goes with us into this fight?

I can answer that question for I have already traveled through the length and breadth of Illinois talking to and with the people.

I know that counted upon our side when the election is held there will be thousands upon thousands of Republican and independent voters who think as we do, who join with us wholeheartedly in the belief that only a nation united behind the Commander in Chief can win this war.

Approximately 2,000,000 electors in Illinois cast their votes in 1940 for Wendell Willkie.

Nothing he has done in the meantime has changed their high opinion of his leadership. On the contrary, everything he has done to uphold the foreign policy of President Roosevelt has the approbation of these voters.

Their votes will be cast in rebuke to the self-asserted leaders of the Republican Party in Illinois.

All over the State there has long since set in a revulsion to obstruction. It is generally recognized that but for the appeasers, the back-seat drivers, the disciples of it can't happen here, this Nation might now be rejoicing in a swiftly won victory.

There has dawned upon Illinois a realization that there might have been no attack on this Nation if President Roosevelt's program of nonappeasement had not been hamstrung by the self-commissioned military strategists who held that we could never be assailed by Japan.

The mothers and fathers of boys called to war, of boys who have already made the supreme sacrifice, are not of a mind to be tolerant of those whose partisan blockade in the Congress resulted in our having too little, too late, in the early engagements of this war.

All of these enlightened people have rallied to our banner.

Along with them, and with us, are marching the great majority of the younger peo-

ple, to whom, as President Roosevelt has said, Hitler and his totalitarianism offers only death.

Within our ranks, I am especially happy to say, are numbered the organized workers of the State, united as never before in this great movement. Labor never fails its true friends.

Our strength, in truth, comes from all elements of the society that makes up Illinois. In the factories, in the mills, in the offices, on the farms, in the homes, in every one of the 102 counties of this great State, are to be found the crusaders in this cause we espouse.

Still I have not enumerated all who go with us.

Spiritually, we are aligned with those three great divisions of the world's population who will, because they must, win this war. These are those who have liberty and will die to retain it, those who have lost liberty and will die to regain it, and those who seek the opportunity for liberty, and will die to achieve it.

This, my friends, is the people's war, and we the people must win to be worthy of our heritage.

Our security can never again be fully established until we have defeated and destroyed the would-be conquerors of the world.

The Senators from Illinois to be elected in November will have a major part to play in making the terms of peace to be written when we have won the war.

A clear course will lie open, and it must lead forever away from tyranny and oppression. It will be among the duties of your Representatives to see to it that an international agency is set up to keep peace among mankind. It will fall to your representatives in the Senate, which ratifies all treaties, to push forward the program set forth in the Atlantic Charter.

Every policy adopted will depend for its success upon the sound judgment, the right intention, the freedom from partisanship, of those delegated to build the machinery of international justice.

Every voter in this State has a right to know all about the candidates in this campaign.

I want them all to know that I stand with Roosevelt.

I stood with Roosevelt before Pearl Harbor. I supported him through the period of our preparation for world conflict.

I was with him heart and soul in his fight to preserve the peace of this Nation and of the world. The record proves this was his constant aim.

Remember this: The position of those who opposed the Commander in Chief both before and after the war was declared was in no way based on principles. It was wholly dictated by politics.

No matter what Roosevelt's political persuasion, I would have stood with him for lend-lease, for arming of merchant ships, for repeal of the arms embargo, for relaxation of the neutrality law, for the Selective Service Act, and for other measures which enabled our Allies and this country to resist the aggressors.

Those opposing us dare not say as much. The naked truth is that if Roosevelt had been isolationist, they would have been interventionist, for they serve not the spirit of democracy but the unholy cause of political opportunism.

I have been a member of Congress since 1935. In addition to supporting the President's foreign policy, my votes in the main were cast for his domestic program.

Because I was a Democrat? No. Because he was Roosevelt? No. I voted as I did because I was under no compulsion of any kind to do anything that was not right.

When I was ten years old my father died. I had to go to work. I worked six days a week from six till six. How could I have opposed legislation proposed by Roosevelt to abolish child labor?



How could I have voted against the wages-and-hours law? Knowing how closely interrelated is the welfare of the farmer and city dweller, how could I have done anything else than answer the call of the agricultural spokesmen of the country to lead the successful fight for establishment of farm parity?

What my conscience and my legislative experience told me was good for business I supported. What my desire for a rounded economy told me was good for industry I supported.

The platform upon which I stand—the platform of this convention—is identical with that upon which I stand as a citizen.

With all the solemnity my soul can summon, I warn this gathering the United Nations can lose this war.

It is to the Commander in Chief that all of the world's downtrodden are looking for an eventual peace of justice.

No name in all the world gives greater pause to the diabolical combination of dictators who would trample our freedom, tear up our Constitution, vitiate our Bill of Rights.

There is a long, hard road to be traveled. No sacrifice is too great to be endured for liberty's sake. We must not be led to despair by hardships at home nor by reverses abroad.

We are fighting for a thorough and just peace as well as for a thorough and just victory.

Thank God, the facilities of freedom are still within reach of all of us.

On November 3 we shall have opportunity to choose between two philosophies. We can adhere to the humanitarianism which Roosevelt has revealed to us or we can cast our lot with the satanic rule of violence which Hitler practices.

I have told you what the campaign was fated to be and is. And I think I know what the outcome will be.

I look forward confidently to the hour when the great majority of the voters of Illinois will send word to Colonel McCormick in Chicago, to Hitler in Berlin, to Mussolini in Rome, and to Hirohito in Tokyo that the free men and women of this State still follow, still honor, still love Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

#### SALE OF WAR BONDS

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of making an announcement which will prove once again that Hoosiers and the Midwest are still made of that sturdy stuff that marked our early pioneers whenever danger threatened and their country called.

St. Joseph County, Ind., has the finest War-bond-buying record in the entire Nation. When the Treasury Department announced that August sales of War bonds were more than \$117,000,000 below the quota, my home county of St. Joseph and the entire State of Indiana had a record of never having failed to meet a quota.

And then something happened—something that quickens the pulse and thrills the heart. It was decided that St. Joseph County should tackle something bigger than just making a quota. It was then that this challenge went out to the Nation:

"Look here, fellow Americans, this is serious business. This idea of merely making a quota is just nonsense. War-

bond buying is a patriotic privilege, a safe and wise investment in security—in victory. We feel that no effort which we can put forth is too great in the winning of this war. We will double our September quota of War bonds, and we challenge the Nation to follow suit."

The original plan was presented by members of the Army and Navy Committee of the Jewish Welfare Board. This group was immediately joined by more than 3,000 men and women workers, representing every religious group and every economic group in every part of the county. Members of our county war-savings staff, headed by Mr. William Klusmeier, rolled up their sleeves and really went to work.

Business executives, union leaders, professional men, farmers, the workers in the humming war plants of the district, the mothers who are giving their boys to the armed services, school children who are working in the salvage drives—these are the people whom America salutes today for the magnificent record which is theirs.

Our September quota was \$1,226,700. The report that comes to me this morning tells that more than two and one-half million dollars, or more than double the quota, were paid in to bring this Double Your Investment in Victory drive to a glorious conclusion.

This was a voluntary and spontaneous move on the part of 160,000 patriotic citizens of St. Joseph County. We invite the Nation to meet the pace. Double your investment in victory and hasten the day when it will be ours.

#### WITNESSES BEFORE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to direct the attention of the membership of this House to a sort of practice or policy that has developed and is being carried on in a number of the committees in this Congress. It deals with the manner in which hearings are conducted on legislation pending before Congress.

Mr. Speaker, many of our committees take an attitude that when the ordinary citizen comes before a committee to express his views on the question at hand, he should be subjected to a sort of cross-examination or inquisition. Mr. Speaker, he should be accorded the same courtesy that is given the heads of the departments and agencies who appear before these committees.

Of course, the committees want to hear from the departments, and all that, but we must not forget that only Members can express their views on the floor of Congress. Many of our committees could do well to give the average John Q. Citizen a little more consideration and more co-operation when he asks to be heard and express his views, so long as he acts within reason. He should not be embarrassed or made to feel that he does not belong there. I offer this suggestion in a spirit of constructive criticism.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein a speech prepared and delivered by myself before the Ohio State Republican convention.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein the address of the Honorable John J. Parker, senior judge, United States Court of Appeals. I have an estimate from the Public Printer. The cost is \$105.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### THE RIGHT OF FRANCHISE

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, among the absolute, unqualified rights of the States is that of regulating the elective franchise; it is the foundation of State authority; the most important political function exercised by the people in their sovereign capacity. Whilst the right of the people to participate in the legislature is the best security of liberty and foundation of all free government, yet it is subordinate to the higher power of regulating the qualifications of the electors and the elected. The original power of the people in their aggregate political capacity is delegated in the form of suffrage to such persons as they deem proper for the safety of the Commonwealth (Brightly Election Cases (*Anderson v. Baker*, 32, 33, 34, 23 Md. 531)).

The whole subject of the regulation of elections, including the prescribing of qualifications for suffrage, is left by the National Constitution to the several States, except as it is provided by that instrument that the electors for Representatives in Congress shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, and as the fifteenth amendment forbids denying to citizens the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Participation in the elective franchise is a privilege rather than a right, and it is granted or denied on grounds of general policy, the prevailing view being that it should be as general as possible consistent with the public safety (Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, 8th ed., Carrington, vol. 2).

The exclusive right of the several States to regulate the exercise of the elective franchise and to prescribe the qualifications of voters was never questioned, nor attempted to be interfered with, until the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States was forced upon unwilling communities (the States then lately in rebellion) by the military power of the general Government, and thus made a part of our organic law; a necessary sequence, perhaps, of the Civil War, but nonetheless a

radical change in the established theory of our Government (Brightly Election Cases, author's note, pp. 42, 43).

The right to vote is not vested, it is purely conventional, and may be enlarged or restricted, granted or withheld, at pleasure, and without fault (McCrary on Elections, p. 9).

#### FARM LABOR

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I represent a very fine farming area. The farmers have been put in a very dangerous condition because they tried to comply with the Government's request to increase their acreage of farm crops. When harvest time came they had been stripped of their labor through the draft and the very high wages paid in defense industries. Dr. Gergory of the State Teachers College located in Fredonia, N. Y., called the students together and told them they had a duty to perform. The response was 100 percent. Three hundred students left and went out on the farms to help harvest the war crops. That is the type of patriotism of the people I have the honor to represent.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. CHIPERFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the Record.)

H. R. 7311

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I called up for the second time the bill H. R. 7311, and for the second time it was objected to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. On next Monday I expect to move to suspend the rules and pass the measure.

It seeks to take care of those service men who have broken down and who are not now taken care of in governmental institutions. As an example, I call your attention to the case of a man who is not from my State, Carroll J. Rawell, who enlisted in the marines in 1940. He served for 2 years in the Marine Corps. He went through Pearl Harbor and was discharged in 1942. Yet, because of the fact it is claimed his record showed he was a mental case in 1939, that man was turned out of governmental institutions and is now in jail in Idaho.

That is one of the many cases I am trying to take care of by this legislation, and on next Monday I expect to move to suspend the rules and pass this bill to take care of cases of this kind.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]?

There was no objection.

#### INVESTIGATION OF SPREAD BETWEEN WHAT THE FARMERS GET AND THE CONSUMERS PAY

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, during the last 2 weeks some rather bitter things have been said about those who produce the food and fiber to sustain this Nation. Some have gone so far as even to charge that the farmer is responsible for the present inflationary tendency. Every well-informed person knows that this charge is not true.

I think the farmers of this Nation are entitled to make out their case before the public. I am today offering the following resolution:

That the Committee on Agriculture or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of commodity prices with particular view toward determining how prices paid by the consumer for agricultural commodities compare with the prices received by farmers for such agricultural commodities.

I hope this resolution may have your approval and that your participation in this investigation may be active and sympathetic.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### AFTER INDUCTION

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an article by Col. Stanley Washburn, the famous war correspondent entitled "After Induction."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The address of Colonel Washburn follows:

#### AFTER INDUCTION—FULL TRAINING PRECEDES COMBAT

Each succeeding day with its depressing news from all fronts makes it increasingly clear that our country is facing a long and arduous struggle. It is now evident that the Germans on the Russian front are not broken in morale nor has their industrial system failed nor is there, as of today, any sign of a sudden collapse.

The situation in Japan as interpreted by the newspaper correspondents who have just reached Portuguese East Africa, where they have access to uncensored cables, indicates only too clearly that the Japanese are prepared for a long war regardless of individual sacrifice and limitless casualties in all branches of their service and throughout the entire civilian population. It seems legitimate then to accept the premise that the war on the eastern front as of today's outlook will hardly be won before the end of 1943, and if Russia fails to hold, God forbid, it may last until 1944. The conquest of Japan, from all the evidence obtainable today, may well take until 1945 or even 1946.

If one accepts this estimate, it is clear that there will be an ultimate need for at least 10,000,000 men in the various branches of the American service. If this be true, it seems obvious that it is only a question of time when by the demand of the public the Selective Service Act is amended to take young men down to the age of 18.

#### WOMEN'S WARTIME SACRIFICES

The greatest sacrifices of war fall primarily on the women of the country. They do not do the spectacular things but it is almost axiomatic that the morale of an army never rises above the capacity of the women at home to undergo sacrifices with fortitude and with faith in the cause and without complaint. Everyone who knows war feels profound sympathy for the suffering of the women and girls who are left at home and upon whom must eventually fall the full brunt of the sacrifices and burdens which war engenders.

From the many letters this writer has received from the mothers of our youth in the armed forces it seems clear that most of them do not understand the efforts that have been and are being made by the War Department to bring our new levies to the highest possible standard, both physically and morally, before they are called upon to do any actual fighting. Many parents seem to believe that whenever their boys are suddenly transferred they are being sent out of the country when the fact is that such orders merely represent an assignment to another center for more advanced training.

It is proper, therefore, that all women and girls in this country who may be called upon to make sacrifices should be given the fullest assurances possible as to how the selectees are being handled, to alleviate their anxiety that their men are being sent out of the country without the training necessary for them to face actual combat.

Information has been made available from authoritative sources in the War Department as to the Government's policy. It is hoped the publication of this information will tend to alleviate the immediate worries of those whose husbands, sons, and brothers are being inducted so rapidly into the Army.

#### OVERSEAS TRAINING IS COMMON

Those with previous experience in the Army understand that all units and individuals leaving the continental United States are not destined for areas immediately threatened by severe combat. Many are sent to security garrisons offering special opportunities for further training. An inexperienced person is likely to draw the erroneous conclusion that departure from this country indicates entry into battle in the immediate future.

It is the War Department's definite policy to give adequate basic military training to selectees before they are sent into battle. Furthermore, there is no basis for the rumor that boys are being sent out of the country for combat duty immediately after their induction. It is the Department's policy to send no soldiers overseas until they have completed their necessary preliminary training. The duration of this training depends upon the experience and qualifications of the selectee and the duty to which he will be assigned. Certain civilian specialists being assigned to similar duties in the Army need only basic military training since they will perform work comparable to their normal vocations rather than engage in actual combat. Hence, the length of the period of training may vary widely according to the nature of the assignment given these individuals. Such men are only those particularly well qualified for their special duties by reason of their civilian experience and in almost every case would be for non-combatant assignment.

Men who are assigned to units directly from reception centers receive their basic training with the unit. Generally, soldiers are not taken from a unit for shipment over-



seas, as it is planned to use the unit as a whole when its training for field service has been completed.

Basic training requires from 6 to 13 weeks. As overseas replacement depots are established they are filled with men who have completed their basic training in the United States. These soldiers will complete their training for field service with the unit to which they are assigned. An overseas assignment certainly does not mean immediate combat duty, but calls only for a continuation of training.

The War Department has no intention of sending men into battle until they have attained the highest possible standard of training.

#### MORAL PREPAREDNESS IS IMPORTANT

Every parent should realize the necessity of a large Army and that early intensive training is the best way to bring their boys home with the least possible casualties and the greatest state of physical well being. Moral preparedness on the part of the women and their willingness, hard as it may be, to accept the realities of war are the surest and most certain way to insure ultimate victory and the preservation of our civilization without which none of our lives would be worth living.

Erected on the grounds of the State Capitol at Columbia is the beautiful bronze statue of a woman. This is South Carolina's tribute to southern womanhood in recognition of their fortitude in the War between the States. The inscription, which should be an inspiration to the women of this generation, both North and South, who are in no way less patriotic or lacking in the virtues of generations past, reads:

"In this monument generations unborn shall hear the voice of a grateful people testifying to the sublime devotion of women of South Carolina in their country's need.

"Their unconquerable spirit strengthened the thin lines of Gray; their tender care was solace for the stricken.

"Reverence for God and unflinching faith in a righteous cause inspired heroism that survived the immolation of sons and courage that bore the agony of suspense and the shock of disaster.

"The tragedy of the Confederacy may be forgotten, but the fruits of the noble service of the daughters of the South are our perpetual heritage."

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader as to what we might expect concerning the anti-inflation bill that has been passed by the Senate.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is the intention to take up this bill tomorrow and it is our hope that it will pass tomorrow; in any event before the end of the week. Just what the legislative status will be tomorrow or what steps will be taken tomorrow I am unable to state now.

The bill will have to go to conference, as there are other matters to be ironed out other than the parity question that is involved. It is my hope that between now and tomorrow those who will serve on the conference committee on the part of the House and on the part of the Senate, assuming the bill goes to conference, will have informal meetings so that if the bill goes to conference there will be speedy

action in returning a conference report to both branches. It is our hope that if the conferees agree there will be no objection to the conference report being considered by this body tomorrow, if the conferees agree by tomorrow, or on the day they do agree.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I hope there will be no objection to consideration tomorrow because everybody wants to get action as quickly as possible.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate that. May I say that the principal reason for waiting until tomorrow is the fact that it is only fair to the membership of this House that an opportunity be given to the Members to study the changes made in the Senate bill, the bill having been in that body for 7 or 8 days. It was expected that the bill would pass the Senate on last Monday, then on Tuesday. It is only fair to the membership of the House that they be given today in which to study the action taken by the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In other words, every effort will be made tomorrow to conclude action as far as the House is concerned upon this particular legislation?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. It is the hope of the leadership, and I am sure I speak the sentiment of all Members of the House, at least I hope I do, that the bill will be concluded tomorrow.

#### COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, for fear that I may not be able to reach all the Members in time I announce now that in all likelihood it will be necessary for the Committee on Rules to meet tomorrow morning at 10:30.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Chenango Telegraph.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### ANTI-INFLATION BILL

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minority leader can tell us what happened to the deadline of October 1 on the anti-inflation bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What happened to the deadline?

Mr. RICH. Yes. Congress had up until October 1 in which to act. Now that the Congress has not acted, what is going to happen?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mature deliberation always changes things.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution recently adopted by the One Hundred and First Infantry Veterans' Association in convention.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### A PAY-AS-YOU-GO INCOME-TAX PLAN

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly favor and advocate the enactment of a pay-as-you-go income-tax law for individual income-tax payers. A law which would embrace the following principles:

First. A provision for the current collection of estimated taxes on current income. In other words, individual income-tax payers would pay their 1943 income tax during the year 1943, the year in which the income is earned.

Second. This would eliminate the ever-current tax indebtedness of income-tax payers; it would change nothing on the books of the Treasury which does not now carry a tax indebtedness as an accounts-receivable item or asset. Current tax collections would not change current income of the Treasury.

Third. Individuals would be paying their income tax as they earn the income and while they have the ability to pay.

Fourth. Such a provision would eliminate the taxpayer's problem of paying a 1942 tax on a high income with the earnings from a 1943 low income.

Fifth. Such a provision would virtually eliminate uncollectible and delinquent taxes from the Treasury's present problems on individual income-tax items.

Sixth. The taxpayer would always know his net income usable for himself and needs.

Seventh. Such a plan would currently take excess earnings and thereby be somewhat beneficial as a deterrent to inflation.

Eighth. This plan would naturally embrace the elimination of one past tax bill for every individual income-tax payer. However, such an elimination of tax bill would not in any way affect the income of the Treasury. It does, however, provide this postponed benefit to taxpayers in that when income ceases no tax debt exists.

Mr. Speaker, on July 27 of this year a Mr. Beardsley Ruml, who is chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and adviser of the National Resources Planning Board, very ably presented such a provision to the Senate Committee on Finance. While I realize that from a parliamentary standpoint we cannot at this time in the House incorporate it in the current tax bill, I am hopeful that the Senate will give consideration to it for I will welcome the opportunity to vote for House approval of such a Senate amendment to the 1942 tax bill.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record on three subjects and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. ENGEL, is recognized for 40 minutes.

#### THE NEW WAR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein several letters written by the War Department and several tables, some compiled by me and some by the War Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 22, 1941, the War Department appeared before the Deficiency and War Department Subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee and requested an appropriation for \$35,000,000 to erect a second new permanent War Department building on the site known as Arlington Farms, a tract consisting of 67 acres which the War Department had acquired from the Agriculture Department. The War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, participated in the hearings which can be found on pages 500 to 513. Prior plans called for a temporary War Department building to be erected at a cost of \$6,500,000. The committee was informed definitely that the construction of this building and the necessary roads, grading, sidewalks, and so forth would not exceed \$35,000,000. The first new War Department building, recently completed at a cost of \$9,504,441, located on Virginia Avenue, was found to be too small.

On the basis of this testimony, the committee recommended that \$35,000,000 be appropriated for the construction of this building on the condition that the \$1,000,000 for paving a parking area be included in the amount. The committee report, under date of July 24, 1941, reads in part as follows:

The cost of the structure, including all incidental and appurtenant costs, is \$35,000,000. The committee was advised that in addition to this sum, approximately \$1,000,000 would be required for fill, grading, and paving a parking area for 10,000 automobiles. The committee has inserted a provision to

require the cost of the parking area to be included within the \$35,000,000.

The building would contain a gross area of 5,100,000 square feet. After deducting space devoted to corridors, cafeterias, files, etc., there would be available approximately 4,000,000 square feet of office space. It will house a personnel of 40,000 (100 square feet of net space per employee).

The report was adopted by the Congress and became therefore the action and mandate of the House of Representatives. Based on this report and argument that the cost would not exceed \$35,000,000 this House voted the appropriation.

Brigadier General—now Major General—Eugene Reybold, now Chief of Engineers, Brigadier General—now Lieutenant General—B. B. Somervell, Col. E. H. Housholder, and G. E. Bergstrom, architect, appeared and testified before the committee. I quote as follows from the testimony from pages 504 and 505:

Mr. WOODRUM. What will be the cost?

General SOMERVELL. \$35,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM. How much will the cost be per square foot?

General SOMERVELL. Gross, about 5,100,000 square feet. The cost will be a little under \$7 per square foot.

Mr. WOODRUM. Will that complete the project, covering everything including the utilities?

General SOMERVELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOODRUM. Including the grading, sidewalks, streets, beautification, and so forth?

General SOMERVELL. Yes, sir; it does not include the parking area, which we have not been able to prepare estimates on.

Mr. LUDLOW. It includes the cost of the building complete, with the grading, sidewalks, and so forth?

General SOMERVELL. Yes, sir.

#### Continuing on page 508:

Mr. TABER. You say that you figure that 1,000,000 square feet of this would be for records and 4,000,000 for help?

General SOMERVELL. That is not quite correct, sir. There would be about a total of 5,100,000 gross, of which we figured about 4,000,000 for office space.

Mr. TABER. Four million for office space, and the rest for records?

General SOMERVELL. And the rest would be machinery space, halls, and other auxiliary spaces.

On page 513 General Somervell testified:

Mr. WOODRUM. There has got to be some filling done there?

General SOMERVELL. There has got to be a considerable amount of filling. Probably some of that \$35,000,000 can be squeezed in there. We will be glad to try that, on the understanding that you will permit us to come back.

Mr. WOODRUM. Would there be any additional costs to round out this project except what you have included here?

General SOMERVELL. No, sir.

Mr. TABER. What will be the additional cost for the roads and pavements along there?

General SOMERVELL. None, sir. I went over this with Mr. McDonald the other day, and this new road, the Richmond Road, and the treatment shown on the map, is already provided for in the plans of the Bureau of Public Roads. We have conformed to their layout.

Based on this testimony, the committee report, the arguments made and assurances given that the total cost would

not exceed \$35,000,000 the committee and House abandoned the plans for a temporary building and voted to appropriate this amount for the erection of another and second new permanent War Department building.

#### PROJECT WILL COST \$70,000,000 INSTEAD OF \$35,000,000

This project will cost \$70,000,000 when completed, instead of \$35,000,000 as represented to the committee. The Field Progress Report of August 31, 1942, shows that the building will cost, when completed, \$49,194,000. This does not include \$8,641,416 for parking lots and access roads spent by the War Department; it does not include \$9,534,000 spent for rights-of-way, access roads, bridges and so forth, by the Public Roads Division; nor does it include \$2,372,041 spent for terracing and landscaping. These four items aggregate \$70,741,897. It is rather amazing that the Army and the Public Roads Administration should spend \$20,547,457 of the taxpayers' money for parking lots, access roads, bridges, landscaping, and so forth, on a project that Lieutenant General Somervell and the War Department testified and represented to the Committee and the House would cost a maximum of \$35,000,000.

I asked the Public Roads Administration for the amount of money spent by them which was made necessary by the new War Department Building and the figures given herein were furnished me in answer to my letter. I asked for only such costs as were made necessary by the new War Department building. Mr. Thomas H. MacDonald, Commissioner, in answering my letter wrote in part as follows:

All of the highway and bridge work which the Public Roads Administration is doing directly to serve the new War Department building in Arlington County, Va., is let to contract after competitive bids. Since there are a considerable number of these contracts it will require a few days to place the information in the form which you request.

A few days later I received the detailed information and I assume that only such sums were set forth as were chargeable to the new building and were made necessary thereby. The District Engineer, however, contends that a part of this amount was spent by the Public Roads Division in straightening out public highways and that part of this sum would have been spent even though the War Department building had not been erected.

I have also in my files a statement showing the contractors and the amount of each Public Roads Administration contract, covering 24 bridges, paving, concrete, and excavation contracts let by the Public Roads Division. This statement shows the number of cubic yards removed, the number of square yards of cement used, the number of tons of asphalt used and so forth.

#### CONTRACTORS

There were three principal contractors who took this job. John McShain, Inc., incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware, has a 60 percent interest in the contract; The Wise Contracting Co.,



incorporated under the laws of the State of Virginia; and the Doyle & Russell Co., copartners, operating in Virginia, each have a 20 percent interest in the contract.

The original John McShain Co. was organized in 1888 by the late John McShain, father of the present John McShain, who is now its president and treasurer. The father died in 1919 and John McShain, Jr., became the sole owner of the business in 1921. He operated this business until March 9, 1933, when it was incorporated under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania as John McShain, Inc. The Pennsylvania corporation was active for 1 year and on April 12, 1934, the present corporation was incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware under the name of John McShain, Inc. This is the parent company and according to all reports is in good financial standing, with an excellent construction record and credit standing. On March 23, 1938, another John McShain Co. was incorporated under the laws of the State of New Jersey, with an authorized and paid-in capital stock of 2,500 no-par common shares. On March 24, 1938, still another John McShain Co. was incorporated under the laws of the State of Maryland, with an authorized and paid-in capital stock of 1,000 no-par common shares.

In addition to the new War Department building, John McShain, Inc., has had the following Government construction contracts:

1. Naval Medical Center-----	\$4,200,000
2. National Airport, hangars, etc.	2,177,200
(2 contracts)-----	2,076,000
3. Storage warehouse at Alexandria-----	1,640,000
4. Jefferson Memorial-----	2,350,000
5. Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Library at Hyde Park, N. Y.--	300,000

Both Doyle & Russell, copartners—composed of Hobart Doyle and John W. Russell—and the Wise Contracting Co. have splendid reputations as contractors and enjoy a good financial standing.

In addition to their interest in the War Department building contract, these companies, operating together, have or have had the following Government construction contracts:

1. Camp Lee, 2 contracts aggregating-----	\$19,000,000
2. General quartermaster depot at Richmond, Va.-----	9,000,000
3. Navy contracts at Yorktown, Va.-----	4,000,000
4. Navy contracts at Newport News-----	10,500,000

The new War Department building contract is a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract, the amount of the fixed fee of the three principal contractors being \$524,270. Sixty percent of the fixed fee goes to the McShain Co. and 20 percent each to Doyle & Russell and the Wise Contracting Co.

There are two principal reasons why 3 contractors should be employed on the job instead of 1: First, financial requirement, and, second, personnel organization, and so forth. A contractor's greatest asset is his organization and the personnel which he brings on the job. With this in view, I had the principal

contractor, Mr. McShain, furnish me with a statement giving me the names of the administrative, supervising, and engineering personnel which each of these contractors brought to the job. There were 125 men in these 3 classifications. Of the 125 men, McShain furnished 65, Doyle & Russell 7, and the Wise Contracting Co. 3. The remaining 50 were hired at the job site from outside sources.

Doyle & Russell furnished 1 executive officer, 1 office manager, 1 assistant office manager, 1 employment manager, 1 paymaster, 1 assistant superintendent, and 1 assistant engineer. The Wise Contracting Co. furnished 3 assistant superintendents, no engineers, and no administrative personnel. The McShain Co. furnished the remainder of the personnel, 65 persons, not hired from outside sources at the job site.

In view of the splendid financial standing and construction record of the McShain Co., it is rather difficult to justify the payment of \$100,000 fixed fee to each, the Doyle & Russell Co. and the Wise Contracting Co., in the face of the fact that of the administrative, supervising, and engineering personnel these 2 companies only furnished 10 persons out of 125 on the job.

I asked the district engineer to inform me just what Doyle & Russell and the Wise Contracting Co. were doing to earn \$210,000 of the \$524,000 fixed fee. He was unable to give me the information. I wrote to Lt. Gen. B. B. Somervell, commander of the headquarters, Services of Supply, asking him for the same information, and I received the following reply:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
HEADQUARTERS, SERVICES OF SUPPLY,  
Washington, D. C., August 2, 1942.  
Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ENGEL: In response to your note of July 30, I wish to advise that the John McShain Co., the Wise Contracting Co., and the Doyle & Russell Co. were associated for the construction of the War Department Building to conform to the policy of using contractors from the region in which the work is located, and their number was dictated because of the size and complexity of the undertaking. The Virginia concerns had a record of accomplishment on previous work in Virginia, and the John McShain Co. an excellent record on work in Washington. The responsibility of the various co-adventurers in the work was for their determination.

Sincerely yours,

BREHON SOMERVELL,  
Lieutenant General, Commanding.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman very graciously stated that when he got to this point he would yield to me. The gentleman has made a very fair statement and I would like to say to the gentleman, without consuming his time, that it has been the custom of the War Department, as well as the Navy Department, on large jobs to hook up 2 or 3 large, dependable contracting firms for the purpose, as stated by General Somervell, of getting their engineering experience, their financial backing, and

so forth, and the War Department, as the gentleman from Michigan has very fairly stated, selected 3 outstanding firms. I would like to remind the gentleman and the House that in July when this construction was started, we were contemplating an army of 1,000,000 or 1,500,000 men. Before the building got very far on the way we were at war, and now with the space of the building increased to over 6,000,000 feet, an almost 25 percent increase in the size of the building, I was told yesterday by the Director of Public Building that the War Department will not be able to get their activities in there and they will still be spread all over Washington.

May I also say, inasmuch as the gentleman is so kind and gracious as to yield to me, the cost of this building, including the cost of change of site and working three shifts, made it a very expensive job. They worked at night over there and this cost includes air-conditioning, a sewage-disposal plant, a parking area, and the construction of roads immediately around it. Including all of these costs, the building will be put up for about \$8 a square foot, which I am told by reliable contractors is not an unreasonable amount under the conditions under which this building was erected.

Mr. ENGEL. I want to call attention to the fact that while the building was increased in gross space from 5,100,000 to 6,000,000 square feet, approximately, the net office space was reduced from 4,000,000 to 2,336,000 square feet.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. May I also remind the gentleman that there are 18,000 people in that building. When completed, there will be over 35,000 in it.

Mr. ENGEL. In referring to building space I am talking about the building as a permanent building for permanent purposes. The rule has been 100 square feet of space per employee. This was the rule followed when General Somervell testified with respect to 40,000 employees for 4,000,000 square feet of space, which means 100 feet of space per employee. You can crowd 35,000 employees into 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 feet of space, but the fact remains we only get 2,300,000 square feet of office space as against 4,000,000 square feet General Somervell said we were to have.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman spoke a moment ago about the fact that the job might have been done by one contractor and thereby save some of the fee to the Government. Let me say to the gentleman that the fees paid to contractors under laws which Congress has very wisely passed are covered by a sliding scale, and the amount of the fee on this job would have been the same whether there was one contractor or a dozen contractors. This would not have affected the fee at all.

Mr. ENGEL. Of course, that may be true, but if the McShain Co. did the job for \$300,000 and gave \$200,000 to the other concerns for doing nothing, then

the fixed fee on this job was \$200,000 too high.

I should like to continue, now, Mr. Speaker, and discuss fixed-fee contractors and subcontractors.

The contractor let all subcontracts. No advertising for bids was done. He called up three or four qualified bidders

and asked them to bid on the job. Sealed bids were opened in the presence of the bidders and the district engineer.

The following are the principal contractors and subcontractors on the Pentagon Building, the type of contract received, the description and estimated cost, and the amount of the fixed fee:

Contractor	Type of award	Type of contract	Description	Estimated cost	Amount of fee
Potts & Callahan.....	Negotiated.....	Cost plus a fixed fee.	Excavation, fill, and grading...	\$4,240,481	\$90,000
Raymond Concrete File Co.	.....do.....	Unit price per foot complete pile.	Concrete piles in place.....	1,892,816	-----
Harry Alexander, Inc.	.....do.....	Cost plus a fixed fee.	Electrical work (main building).	4,800,000	80,600
Baker-Smith, Mehring & Hanson Co., Inc.	.....do.....	.....do.....	Air conditioning, ventilating (main building).	8,106,600	139,612
Geo. A. Ford Electric Co.	.....do.....	.....do.....	Electrical work, exterior sewer- age, and powerhouse.	787,601	15,000
Fred Brutschy Co., Inc.	.....do.....	.....do.....	Plumbing, gas mains, sewer mains.	3,234,208	67,200
Carlson Bros. of Mich- igan, Inc.	.....do.....	.....do.....	Mechanical equipment, out- side piping.	2,100,000	64,020
Kenmar Steel Con- struction Co.	.....do.....	.....do.....	Placing of reinforcing rod and mesh.	1,020,000	31,390
Lamson Corporation.....	Bid.....	Lump sum, in- stalled.	Pneumatic tube system and appurtenances.	123,348	-----
Overly Manufacturing Co., Inc.	.....do.....	Unit price, in- stalled.	Slate roofing, sheet-metal work (main building).	310,353	-----
Warren-Ehret Co.....	.....do.....	.....do.....	Composition and build-up roof and flashings, main building, powerhouse and refrigerating plant.	157,030	-----
McNulty Bros. Co., Inc., and Kraft- Murphy Co.	Negotiated.....	Cost plus a fixed fee.	Lathing, plastering, and sus- pended ceilings.	2,993,868	63,240
N. Snellenburg & Co., Inc.	Bid.....	Unit price, in- stalled.	Asphalt tile flooring.....	251,000	-----
Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Inc.	.....do.....	.....do.....	Glass and glazing main build- ing and powerhouse.	86,604	-----
Do.....	.....do.....	Lump sum, in- stalled.	Structural glass partitions, toilets.	102,000	-----
Warsaw Elevator Co.....	.....do.....	.....do.....	Electrically operated eleva- tor—powerhouse.	3,307	-----
Do.....	.....do.....	.....do.....	Dumbwaiters.....	8,325	-----
Roman Mosaic & Tile and Columbia Mo- saic & Tile.	Negotiated.....	Cost plus a fixed fee.	All interior, tile and terrazzo work.	290,600	15,000
Edw. W. Minte, Inc., and Van Florence Co.	.....do.....	.....do.....	All interior and exterior painting.	373,759	11,150
Otis Elevator Co.....	Bid.....	Lump sum, in- stalled.	Escalators.....	511,380	-----
Montgomery Elevator Co.	.....do.....	.....do.....	Freight elevators, mail lifts, doors.	133,000	-----

#### DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING

The Pentagon Building, as its name implies, is a five-sided structure. The building, including a 6-acre court in the center, covers 42 acres of ground. The upper stories of the building are divided into concentric wings of which there are five. In other words, there are five buildings, one within another. The exterior side of the building is completely faced with limestone. All other building walls are formed out of concrete. The building is said to be the largest of its kind in the world. It is almost a mile in circumference. The corridors are arranged in such a way that the distance between any two points in the building will not exceed 1,800 feet. The cafeteria will seat from 6,000 to 8,000 at one time. Seven and one-half months after construction began on this building, war workers moved in at the rate of 1,000 per week.

#### FLOOR SPACE

The building provides for 5,776,352 square feet of gross floor space, with a net office space of 2,362,580 square feet. It provides for additional potential space which is being completed of 843,586 square feet, making a total gross area of 6,619,938 square feet. The building will have a gross area of approximately 152

acres of floor space. The following is a break-down of the floor space in the building:

Areas	
NEW WAR DEPARTMENT OFFICE BUILDING	
	Space in square feet
1. Net office space less potential corridors.....	2,362,580
2. Potential corridors.....	325,253
3. Net storage.....	861,256
4. Special assigned areas:	
a. Concessions.....	29,744
b. Concourse.....	75,624
c. Kitchens, cafeterias, lunch bars.....	243,878
d. Public Building Adminis- tration: Maintenance and operations.....	39,440
e. Bus terminal.....	83,411
f. Telephone Co.....	21,638
g. Garage.....	77,254
	571,039
5. Permanent circulation, includes stairs.....	856,329
6. Toilet rooms and janitor closets.....	122,252
7. Machine rooms and utility spaces.....	281,316
8. Guard, messenger, and waiting and dressing rooms.....	10,200
9. Covered interior roads (not in bus terminal).....	37,300

Space in  
square feet

10. Exterior and interior walls and other structural features.....	273,066
11. Power house.....	75,756

Gross area within exterior of  
outside walls being con-  
structed, including power-  
house..... 5,776,352

#### FUTURE ADDITIONAL SPACE FOR WHICH STRUCTURAL PROVISION HAS BEEN MADE

Fourth floor intermediate—3 rings.....	354,725
Mezzanine between subbasement and ground floor.....	488,861
	843,586

Gross area provided for in  
structure as designed..... 6,619,938

The building itself appears to be well constructed, with a minimum of steel being used. There are no unnecessary architectural features, such as fountains, statues, and so forth, which were eliminated, I was informed, for the present. I visited various offices which were occupied, including the office of the Chief of Ordnance and a number of other offices of heads of branches. These offices were very simple, using an economy of space that was marked and lacking everything that pointed to the elaborate. The project was started September 11, 1941, and I was informed would be completed November 15, 1942, or 2 months ahead of schedule. On May 1, 1942, occupancy of the building began and since that time 1,000 workers were moved in per week. On July 28, when I visited the building, some 12,000 workers were being housed.

#### ENGINEERING AND OVERHEAD

Engineering cost on the building, not including mechanical and landscaping architectural engineering, will amount to \$1,450,000. The landscape architect work was performed by Mr. A. D. Taylor, who is receiving a fixed fee of \$14,000 for the same.

All engineering was done by the Army with the exception of the mechanical engineering, which was done by Mr. Charles S. Leopold, of Philadelphia, Pa., on a fixed-fee basis. This included the air conditioning, the heating, and the ventilating. The fixed fee was \$74,708.

#### LABOR

Approximately 13,000 men were employed on the job while at its peak, of whom 4,600 were carpenters building concrete forms and performing other carpenter work. The crews were organized under a general superintendent and an outside superintendent into 5 sections. Each section has a section superintendent and a night superintendent. Each section superintendent has a labor foreman and a carpenter foreman. The labor and carpenter crews were broken up into small groups of 15 to 25 men each, with a pusher for each group. The contractor states that carpenters were actually carpenters.

#### RATIO OF LABOR TO MATERIAL

The ratio of labor cost to material cost on this job as of June 15, 1942, was: Labor 56 percent and material 44 percent.



## CLOSED SHOP

The John McShain Co. has always operated and now operates under a closed shop. Doyle & Russell and the Wise Contracting Co., I am informed, were not operating under a closed shop. Mr. John McShain informed me that he hires or fires as he sees fit; that he collects no dues and that there is no check-off system. No labor trouble of any consequence existed to date on the job.

## LABOR SHORTAGE

Some delay was caused by the fact that there was a certain shortage in field labor. The contractor stated that he was about 50 percent short of the required crew on steel rod setters; that he got about 12 steam fitters out of 200 asked for; that he was about 25 percent short on electricians and 34 percent short on plumbers. About 15 to 25 percent of the delay on the job was due to the shortage of skilled labor. There was no shortage of common labor.

## APPROVED WAGE SCALE

The rate of pay was determined by the Secretary of Labor under the Bacon-Davis Act. The wage scale was fixed for 172 different types of labor, skilled, semi-skilled, and common.

The following table gives the rate of the types of labor doing the vast amount of labor. The first column shows the rate as originally determined; the second column the rate as increased. There were no decreases.

	Original rate per hour	Increased rate per hour
Asbestos workers.....	\$1.75	-----
Boilermakers.....	1.50	-----
Bricklayers.....	1.75	-----
Carpenters, journeymen.....	1.62½	-----
Cement finishers.....	1.50	-----
Concrete workers.....	.85	-----
Electricians.....	1.80	-----
Laborers.....	.85	\$0.87½
Lathers.....	1.75	-----
Linoleum and soft-tile layers.....	1.62½	-----
Machinists.....	1.25	-----
Millwrights.....	1.62½	-----
Ironworkers.....	2.00	-----
Painters.....	1.71½	-----
Painters, spray.....	2.00	-----
Plasterers.....	2.00	-----
Plumbers.....	1.65	1.75
Plumber's laborers.....	.87½	-----
Roofers (composition).....	1.45	-----
Roofers (slate).....	1.75	-----
Rodmen, reinforced steel placers.....	1.62½	-----
Sheet metal workers.....	1.75	-----
Steam fitters.....	1.65	1.75
Stone carvers.....	1.75	-----
Stonecutters (building).....	1.50	-----
Stonemasons.....	1.75	-----
Tile setters.....	1.50	-----
Truck drivers:		
2 tons or less.....	.70	-----
Over 2 tons.....	.80	-----
Heavy flat trucks.....	1.00	-----
Welders.....	1.10	-----
Carpenter foremen and pushers.....	1.75	-----
Ironworker foreman.....	2.35	-----
Painter foreman.....	1.93	-----
Electric subforeman.....	1.925	-----
Electric foreman.....	2.05	-----
Labor foremen and pushers.....	.975	-----
Superintendent reinforcing unit.....	2.00	-----
Bricklayer foreman.....	2.01	-----
Cement finisher foreman.....	1.75	-----

## POWER SAWS

Power saws were used on the job. Each section had a small mill where forms for concrete were made up.

## OVERTIME

The amount of overtime paid to June 15, 1942, was \$1,730,000, and it is estimated that it will require \$800,000 additional overtime to complete the building, or a total of overtime on the job of \$2,530,000.

## UTILITIES

The cost of utilities on this job was more than doubled because the site was changed 1 mile south from the original to its present location. The original cost of utilities was estimated at \$2,733,000. The cost of the same utilities on the present site will be \$6,322,608, or an excessive cost of \$3,589,608. The following is an itemized statement of the cost of the utilities on the original site, on the present site, and the excessive cost on the present site.

Comparative costs of utilities on original and present site

	Cost, original site	Cost, present site	Excess cost, present site
Water mains.....	\$250,000	\$523,400	\$273,400
Boiler plant and utility tunnel.....	2,100,000	3,841,126	1,741,126
Electric distribution.....	20,000	787,748	767,748
Sewage disposal.....	263,000	570,397	307,397
Sewers and storm sewers.....	100,000	599,931	499,931
Total.....	2,733,000	6,322,608	3,589,608

In building the sewage-disposal plant, the old site provided for a gravity-flow system while the new site made it necessary that a pumping system be installed. The sewage system provided will also take care of Fort Meyer and the Navy Building. A complete new electrical distribution system was required by the new site, but it is claimed that some saving will be made annually by reason of the new distribution system.

## Present site

Twenty-three million one hundred and ninety-eight thousand board feet of lumber was purchased at a cost of \$8,360,500. The average cost was \$37.22 per thousand board feet. In comparing the cost of this lumber per thousand, it must be remembered that the larger portion of this lumber was common shiplap lumber used for concrete forms. Practically no expensive lumber such as siding, flooring, and so forth, was used. Lumber was inspected as to moisture content, grade, and quantity by both contractor and construction quartermaster. There was very little waste lumber on the job. Concrete forms were hauled from site to site and rebuilt. Very little waste remained.

## RAILROADS

One mile of the main railroad line of the Pennsylvania Railroad was relocated at a cost of \$82,500. The railroad company is trading rights-of-way with the Government. The Army purchased 130-pound rails to build this relocated track. These were bought at \$28.50 per ton, re-lay rails being used. In addition, 1 mile of spur, or temporary siding, was laid.

The old 100-pound rails of the main line were used in the construction of this siding. The cost difference in the construction of the rail will be taken into consideration in the negotiation of the right-of-way.

## EQUIPMENT

Appraised value of the equipment used on the job was as follows:

Appraised present value of equipment on hand as of Sept. 26, 1942:	
Contractor-owned (all contractors).....	\$395,030.00
Equipment companies (third parties).....	202,351.00
Government-owned (transfer value).....	1,560,800.00
Total.....	2,158,181.00

Rentals paid to Sept. 26, 1942:

Contractor-owned (all contractors).....	198,506.00
Equipment companies (third parties).....	79,939.79
Total.....	278,445.79

Estimated rental costs to completion:

Contractor-owned (all contractors).....	18,000.00
Equipment companies (third parties).....	20,000.00
Total.....	38,000.00

One million three hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars has been paid in rentals and applied to equipment which has since been recaptured and is now owned by the Government. So that amount of money is represented by Government-owned equipment and a large part of that equipment is to be and is being transferred to other Government projects.

Note rentals paid on recaptured third-party equipment have been deducted from rental paid figure and added to the cost of Government-owned equipment. Reimbursement received for equipment shipped to other projects \$222,689.

## RENTAL SCHEDULE

The rental paid to contractors was fixed by the Army White schedule which is below the old Associated General Contractors' rates. The equipment companies as a rule received the old Associated General Contractors' schedule. All equipment, including trucks, was checked twice on the job each day. Also checked at gates coming and going.

## GRADING COST

It is estimated that 4,000,000 cubic yards of dirt has been or will be moved, not including the work being done on roads by the Roads Administration. Hand excavations average \$1 per cubic yard. Machine filling and excavation have cost to date 42 cents per cubic yard.

## COMPARATIVE COSTS OF OTHER BUILDINGS

The following is a comparative statement showing the names of 8 public buildings erected since 1935, the cost per gross square foot, and the date of final completion. The cost of the new Pentagon Building will be approximately \$12

per gross square foot, or nearly \$30 per square foot of net office space based on 5,776,352 square feet of gross space and 2,362,580 square feet of net space.

	Cost per gross square foot	Date of final completion
1. Social Security.....	\$7,478	Mar. 13, 1942
2. Railroad Retirement.....		
3. General Federal Office Building No. 1.....	5,384	June 8, 1941
4. New War Department Building, District of Columbia.....	8,122	Oct. 28, 1941
5. The National Archives.....	8,944	Mar. 16, 1938
6. South Interior.....	9,204	Sept. 23, 1938
7. Labor Department and Interstate Commerce Commission.....	9,132	Sept. 4, 1935
8. Department of Justice.....	10,974	Sept. 5, 1935

<sup>1</sup> Last inspection.

#### CONCLUSION

War Department officials testified that the cost of the building, including access roads, parkways, and so forth, would not exceed \$35,000,000—plus \$1,000,000 for converting the Hoover Airport into a parking area. Congress appropriated \$35,000,000 with the instructions given the War Department in the committee report that the million-dollar cost of the parking area must be included in the \$35,000,000. The actual cost will be in excess of \$70,000,000. The contract for air conditioning, heating, and ventilating was \$8,106,600, or almost 25 percent of the original cost of the building as represented to the committee.

The War Department represented to the committee that a building with 5,100,000 square feet of space would be constructed, of which 4,000,000 square feet of space would be available for net office space, which would house 40,000 employees, with the required space of 100 square feet per employee. The building actually constructed provides for 5,776,352 square feet, of which only 2,362,580 square feet would be net office space and which would accommodate approximately 23,000 employees if they followed the rule of 100 square feet of net office space per employee.

On or about August 31, 1941, President Roosevelt wrote a letter to Senator ADAMS in which he referred to the \$35,000,000 item for the construction of an office building on the site of the former Department of Agriculture Experimental Farm. In this letter he stated his belief that it would be unwise to provide office space on this site for more than 20,000 War Department employees. The Washington papers at that time carried items to the effect that President Roosevelt ordered the War Department "to scale down the size of its proposed \$35,000,000 building." In another Washington paper, he is quoted as saying the proposed building would be approximately half of the \$35,000,000 structure that the Department wished to erect. The President stated that the completed building should contain some 2,000,000 to 2,500,000 square feet of net office space as against the 4,000,000 square feet of space the War Department proposed. The public was led to believe that the building would not only be scaled down from 40,000 to 20,000 employees to be housed, but it would

be scaled down from \$35,000,000 to an amount which would be commensurate with the reduction of the number of employees to be housed.

Now we find that while the new square feet of space was scaled down from 4,000,000 to 2,362,000 square feet, the cost has increased from \$35,000,000 to more than \$70,000,000.

It was represented to the committee that the 67 acres of land, known as the Agricultural Experimental Farm, would be adequate without the purchase of additional lands, with the exception of 146.05 acres of the Hoover Airport for the parking area. We now find that in addition to these two tracts they have purchased 86.56 acres for \$479,316 more. This is assuming that the amount deposited in court will be adequate to meet the amount allowed in several condemnation suits.

General Somervell testified before the committee that the cost of 5,100,000 square feet of gross space and 4,000,000 square feet of net office space would cost us \$35,000,000, including access roads, parkways, and so forth. This would be approximately \$7 per square foot for the gross space and \$9 per square foot for the net office space. We now find that the gross space, not including unfinished portions, will be 5,776,352 square feet and the net office space 2,362,580 square feet and the cost will be in excess of \$70,000,000. This would put the cost of the gross space up from \$7 to \$11 per square foot and the net office space from \$9 to almost \$30 per square foot. For the purpose of comparison, I am including the tabulation of the eight Government buildings which show the cost per gross square foot and the date of final completion. I do not have the net office space of these buildings. These costs of the eight buildings do not include sewage disposal plants, streets, and other utility costs. On the other hand these eight buildings were of much more elaborate construction and were built out of much more expensive material.

The sources of funds used for this building were as follows: Appropriation by act of Congress, \$35,000,000; paid out of the President's special fund for expediting production equipment and supplies, \$14,250,000; paid out of defense highway funds, \$9,000,000; balance unaccounted for, \$11,750,000.

On May 7, 1942, General Somervell wrote the following letter to the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, attempting to justify the action he took:

MAY 7, 1942.

HON. CLARENCE CANNON,  
Chairman, Committee on House  
Appropriations,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CANNON: On July 22 I appeared before your committee and requested the sum of \$35,000,000 for the purpose of erecting a War Department building in Arlington, Va. Our estimate was based on the use of a site which had been carefully selected both from the standpoint of usefulness and of economy in construction.

As you are aware, it was necessary to use another site which has proven even more difficult and expensive than we had anticipated when we stated to your committee that,

although it was impossible to give any accurate figures on the increased cost of construction resulting from the change in site, it would be at least \$5,000,000.

The change in site not only complicated the construction problems, but also compelled a different architectural treatment. Our prepared plans had to be abandoned and the building had to be redesigned to meet the difficult foundation conditions and other peculiarities of the site as well as to develop appropriately the southern entrance to the Nation's Capital. The difficulties were further increased by the requirement that the building had to be suitable for record warehousing after the expiration of the war.

The sudden outbreak of the war and the immediate demand for more space for war activities further added to the cost. It was at once apparent that a maximum of office space in the new building would have to be provided and that as rapidly as possible in order to insure more efficient operation of the War Department as well as to avoid the expense and construction effort involved in providing millions of square feet of temporary space. Instructions were issued to expedite the work in every possible way.

A million square feet of office space are now available and an additional half million will become available in June. Progress on the job has been outstanding in the construction field. Our present schedule promises the remaining space in sizable increments until the building is completed next fall.

It was our understanding that the Public Buildings Administration would provide those items of operating equipment such as that for cafeterias which in War Department buildings are normally supplied from maintenance funds. This was not done and to avoid delay in occupancy, the War Department is purchasing these items.

Because of the increasing demand for space, it also became necessary to abandon any plan to reduce the originally contemplated size of the building. It was found that record storage space could be added in the lower levels at a cost comparing favorably to that of providing storage space in our depots. The part of the structure which extends over the old Washington Airport was particularly adapted to this purpose, 650,000 square feet of storage space being added.

It was considered advisable to approach the utility problem from the long-range viewpoint in order to insure the maximum ultimate economy to the United States. The water supply and sewage disposal systems are able to take care of all existing governmental installations in and around Arlington with some spare capacity for future expansion. The wisdom of this decision which added to the first cost, has already been borne out by the considerable saving that will accrue to the United States by reason of the fact that the utilities to the dormitories, now about to be constructed on the originally proposed site, can be taken care of by our lines.

Originally it was planned to purchase electric power at the using voltages. Later it was found that by buying power at a higher voltage the ultimate cost to the United States would be less although the first cost for transformers and auxiliary equipment would be some \$800,000.

By reason of these additions and the accelerated rate of construction demanded after Pearl Harbor, it is now expected that the work will cost about \$14,250,000 above the appropriated figure. We are not, however, asking the Congress for additional funds, as the amount is being obtained from unexpended balances of other War Department construction projects. It is hoped that the above procedure meets with the approval of the Committee.

Sincerely yours,  
BREHON SOMERVELL,  
Lieutenant General, Commanding.



General Somervell states that he appeared before our committee on July 22, 1941. Attention is called to the fact that while General Somervell appeared before our committee on July 22, 1941, this letter was not written until May 7, 1942—or nearly 10 months after he appeared before our committee; 8 months after the building was commenced and 6 days after employees began moving in. He did not ask for instructions, but was merely trying to explain why he had violated the mandate of the committee and House which instructed him that he must keep his costs within \$35,000,000 for 4,000,000 square feet of net office space.

CONFIDENTIAL STATUS OF THIS INFORMATION

A number of reports used herein were either marked "confidential" or sent to me by letter which stated it was considered confidential. The break-down of the 6,000,000 square feet of space was especially considered confidential, and I was called on the phone by the War Department and informed that the public relations branch of the Army had ordered that it was not to be given out. The progress report which gives the information pertaining to the progress of the building, the cost and other information was also stamped as confidential. Despite these facts, I am placing these figures in the RECORD.

It seems rather strange to me that while the fact that the building would contain 5,100,000 square feet of space was not considered confidential, the figures submitted later that the building would contain 6,619,938 square feet of gross space, of which 5,776,000 was to be available at once, was considered confidential. It seems rather strange to me that the testimony to the effect the building was to have 4,000,000 square feet of net office space was not considered confidential while the fact that out of 5,776,000 square feet of gross space we were to have only 2,362,000 square feet of net office space was considered confidential.

It seems rather strange that while the fact that the building was to cost a maximum of \$35,000,000 was not considered confidential, the fact that the building project is going to cost approximately \$70,000,000 is considered confidential. Is it not rather strange that the fact that the building was to house 40,000 employees was not considered confidential but information showing that the project will cost nearly twice the amount originally estimated and will house only half the employees contemplated is confidential.

I am taking the position that the taxpayers are entitled to have all the facts pertaining to costs and determine just what they are getting for their money and there are no facts published herein marked "confidential" that by the widest stretch of imagination could be considered as confidential on the ground that they will be of aid to the enemy.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR WASTE AND EXTRAVAGANCE

Responsibility for preventing the waste of the taxpayers' and bondbuyers' money is that of both the executive and the legislative branch of the Gov-

ernment. While the legislative branch of the Government, individually and through the Vinson, May, and Truman committees, have attempted to prevent and recover part of this waste there is no evidence that the President himself has taken one step either as the Chief Executive of the Nation or as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy to prevent some of the shameful waste of the taxpayers' and bondbuyers' money.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Did the gentleman give attention to hallways, and so forth?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes, I did. The building itself at its outer ring is almost a mile around, and yet you could go from any one point to another point in the building by walking about 1,800 feet. I was very much impressed with the design of the building from the point of view of the saving of space.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And the gentleman thinks there was no space wasted in the halls or in the interior part of the building?

Mr. ENGEL. I do not want to say that. I will let the gentleman examine the amount of space. I am putting into the RECORD a table showing how every foot of space was used. After I got this report I was told it was confidential. The Public Relations Division of the Army had orders not to give this out. Some of the reports that I got were marked "confidential." It seems to me ridiculous to mark office space "confidential." If there is going to be any bombing, the Japs certainly are not going to come over here and measure a building that covers 42 acres of ground before they start any bombing. They are going to bomb it whenever they can and wherever they can. You will find in my reports, the amount of space that is used for stairways and halls and rooms of all types.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I recall a year ago when this matter was before the House that the sum involved was approximately \$35,000,000. Will the gentleman advise us when the direction of the House, or the Congress, was given to increase that sum, or practically double it for the construction of this building?

Mr. ENGEL. I am very glad that the gentleman has asked that question. General Somervell appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and asked for an appropriation, and the House passed a bill ordering him to keep the amount within \$35,000,000. Ten months after that, and 8 months after the building was commenced, and some 6 days after employees had begun to move in, General Somervell wrote a letter to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, telling him why he did not follow the mandate of the House.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman think under the supplemental acts it would be possible to recapture some of the cost to the Navy and the

Army under the contracts that have been made?

Mr. ENGEL. Under the cost-plus contracts, but how are you going to recapture money, for instance, out of the \$20,000,000 spent for roads and bridges?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman will permit, under the terms of the contract, as to what are reasonable and allowable, the Army itself has authority to determine whether the units of cost were excessive.

Mr. ENGEL. That is very true.

I want to congratulate the able and distinguished gentleman from South Dakota upon the splendid work he did in obtaining the adoption of the amendment to the appropriation bill which provides for the renegotiation of these contracts. It was he who introduced the original amendment in the subcommittee which was adopted in committee. When that amendment was stricken from the bill on a point of order made in the House, it was the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] who offered a substitute which was adopted by the House. He fought for his amendment in the Senate-House conference committee when the matter was in conference. He and I were both on the conference committee. A great deal of the credit for saving nearly \$1,000,000,000 for the taxpayers in the renegotiation of these contracts must go to him.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Let me say it is my belief that under the terms of the renegotiation provision of the sixth supplemental act, if the \$200,000 paid to these subsidiary firms is an improper allowance it can be recaptured by the Government.

Mr. ENGEL. There is no question about the \$200,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And also other excessive costs.

Mr. ENGEL. I was taking into consideration the picture as a whole. Naturally if you go up there and build all those bridges and put gold railings around them, you cannot recover the cost of the gold railings.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would like to reiterate that the fee paid for that job was exactly the fee that the War Department has paid for every construction job they have given out. The division of the fee between these contractors is their own affair. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] has been eminently fair and has performed a great deal of hard work, but with all deference to his statement, the two Virginia firms performed very notable and very real service in the construction of these buildings. That will be borne out by the War Department and the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. ENGEL. I asked General Somervell to tell me exactly what they did. There is his letter. If the gentleman from Virginia has anything to place in the RECORD showing exactly what they did, I shall be glad to have him do so. I want all the facts.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Taking into consideration the demoralizing effect of this waste and extravagance and spending for nonessential and nondefense purposes, and all the facts involved that you have reiterated in your statement, do you think there might be a real question as to whether the building of the War Department building is going to help win the war or help lose the war?

Mr. ENGEL. If the War Department had come before this House and asked for \$70,000,000 instead of \$35,000,000, they certainly would not have received the appropriation.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This building was constructed and the work done under a cost-plus contract?

Mr. ENGEL. That is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. As I understand the gentleman's statement, it was contemplated in the first instance, when we were assured that the whole thing would not cost over \$35,000,000, that it would provide housing for 40,000 workers. Now, that was the purpose of the construction of this building—the necessity for this office space, was it not?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What is the reason that this project has cost \$70,000,000, and you actually have office space for only about half the number contemplated when the provision for \$35,000,000 was made? Where is the leak? What is the trouble?

Mr. ENGEL. In the first place, you have a heating and ventilating plant, \$8,100,000, in a building that is supposed to have cost \$35,000,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 45 minutes.

#### WHAT IS WRONG WITH CONGRESS?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I requested 45 minutes for a general dissertation on the subject of What Is Wrong With Congress?

There is evidently a growing belief in the country that something is wrong with the legislative branch of this Government. One needs but to examine the current press comment, which has been re-echoed in all sections of the country, to ascertain that there is a growing belief that there is something inherently and fundamentally wrong with the operation of this body or in the composition and character of the Congress.

Last week in a double-spread editorial the Washington Post starts out by saying:

At a time when the Nation faces the greatest crisis in its history, the spectacle presented by our Congress—one of the few free legislative bodies left in the world—is anything but encouraging.

Last week when the furore and controversy over the price-control bill was at its height the Washington Daily News editorialized as follows:

Poor old Congress! Poor old fumbling, scared Congress, blindly throwing away its

great opportunity to prove that it can do its duty to the Nation at war. It is a tragic spectacle.

While the controversy was at its height Raymond Clapper, who is one of our outstanding commentators, and who writes rationally and temperately, had this to say:

Is Congress strong enough to break the chains that make it a slave of the farm lobby? Members must be actually unhappy over their slavery.

In this month's Reader's Digest, William Hard, who writes objectively, contributed an article which began as follows:

Public esteem for the Congress has been falling and today it is probably lower than ever before in our history.

All this, of course, is not new; this is not the first time that Congress has been caustically berated in the history of the Republic. I have on another occasion indicated to the House some of the comments that have been made in other generations in our history when men who are now revered as part of the great memory structure of the country and who are set up for emulation by the youngsters of the schools were written about then as we are written about now. Let me add to those examples which are in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some additional items that have come to my attention.

Back in 1865 when we were experiencing a rather stressful period in our history, Artemus Ward, the humorist and lecturer who was something of a precursor of the modern commenorator, wrote—

Congress, you won't do. Go home, you miserable devils, go home.

Mark Twain, in 1882, queried from the lecture platform as follows:

Reader, suppose you were an idiot, and suppose you were a Member of Congress; but I repeat myself.

In *The Education of Henry Adams*, Henry Adams quotes a member of the Cabinet of President Grant as saying—and, parenthetically, how appropriate it is now since there have been charges of selfishness and since certain Members of the Congress have been identified with a group that is illustrated by a porker running in the direction of an objective called higher prices—this is particularly appropriate which this member of Grant's Cabinet is quoted as saying—

You cannot use tact with a Congressman. A Congressman is a hog. You must take a stick and hit him over the snout.

Then, in May 1836—that is 106 years ago—Amos Lawrence makes this comment in his diary. He said—

I have passed 2 hours in the Representatives' hall and in the Senate chamber today. I could learn nothing of the merits of any of the questions, but I had preference such as one feels in seeing two dogs fight, that one should beat.

Thus the temper and the fashion of this comment is not new, because the very annals of our country are redolent with that same idea. I propose to say as a Member of this body what in my

judgment is wrong today. I follow the philosophy of that Irish poet who said:

Every man's death diminishes me because I am part of mankind.

Every Member of the Congress must necessarily be diminished by what they say about us as a body. I have some pride about this Congress standing now on the perspective of nearly 10 years of service, and I propose to speak up. I want this Congress, I want my Congress—since I am a part of it—to enjoy the esteem and confidence and to enjoy the good will of the people of the United States of America whom we serve; and so, while everybody else is making an appraisal, while every commentator, every radiocaster, every man who does a column is appraising Congress, it occurs to me that probably it would be a little novel for a Member of this body to appraise the body of which he is a part—and the Seventy-seventh Congress particularly. I do this frankly; I do it candidly; if it required any tartness I would inject it here. This Congress has done a reasonably good job. We have provided the funds with which to operate the Government and carry on the war effort. We have provided the sinews of war in the form of requested legislation. We have taken stock from time to time of the public mind, since we are public representatives. We have in a manner conducted some investigations, sporadic as they may be, in the hope of serving the public welfare. We have exercised restraint in the interest of national unity, and, if anything, we have bent over backward and too frequently withheld criticism where it was due. I think, as I evaluate the whole picture, we were trying not to throw a monkey wrench into the machinery of morale and of unity.

The power of the purse that we enjoy has been rather ineffective for the very good reason that if we did withhold defense appropriations and war appropriations in many cases where incompetence was a matter of intimate and personal knowledge we would be charged with sabotaging the war effort. We have nothing to say about appointments; we have nothing to say about who shall operate W. P. B. or O. P. A.; we have nothing to say about who shall run the Office of the Coordinator of InterAmerican Affairs, or any of these other agencies of the Government that are directly and indirectly related to the war effort; that is not within our province, and I suppose very properly so; yet, notwithstanding those limitations, on one day we will be charged with being rubber stamps and on another day of the same week we are charged with being hogs, or that we are the tools of the lobbyists, or that we are subservient to the pressure groups of the country.

I recognize that as we perform our functions and pursue our duties we have a handicap that probably other Congresses did not have in like proportion. One is the wealth of detail and routine with which we are saddled today: Rendering assistance in old-age assistance cases, trying to direct young men in the



country and constituents with reference to enlistments and commissions, we must pursue priorities in the matter of goods for industries, for hospitals, for schools, for dwelling houses. We are expected to assist our people in securing insofar as possible defense plants and industries; we must check up on casualty lists; we must prosecute veterans' cases; we must render assistance in the application for visas through the State Department, help constituents procure loans from the R. F. C., help people in business—retail, wholesale, and manufacturing business—on modifications of the frequent regulations which impose hardship and injustice.

We are expected to bring the brain children of the budding inventors in our district and seek to wash them through the inventors council and bring them to the light of day. We must prosecute private claims, look after transfers, and act as a liaison man for the people.

It is pretty easy for somebody to stand up and say, "Well, that is routine work and a Congressman should not have to bother about that sort of thing." Well, it is not as easy as it sounds for the very good reason that we are so responsive to the people and live so intimately with them that you cannot give the folks a brush-off. You cannot sit yourself in a rarefied office somewhere and undertake to create the impression that that is the sanctuary in which only a select group may come. You must make yourself readily accessible to the people, and you should. Constituents are more than voters. They are folks. They are friends. They have problems which mean much to them. Because of the great amount of personal attention that must be devoted to the great amount of work that has been entailed as the result of the war and the elaboration of the functions of government, so we are loaded down with far more work than any other Congress, I suppose, in the history of the country.

However, let nobody write and let nobody infer from these remarks that that, in my judgment, constitutes an excuse or an apology for the things that we should do or have not done or could do. I am persuaded that the Congress could do more. I am persuaded that the Congress as a body can do a far better job and it will do more, it will do a better job, if it will divest itself of the fear that we somehow experience because we are afraid of the reproaches of the people when we do something for ourselves and spend a little money upon ourselves as an institution to make this a more effective body. When we do that, instead of being pushed around by the executive branch and by the bureaus of government, we will do a little pushing on our own score in the interest of better government.

I have not heard one but a thousand lamentations in the well of this House over the years, relative to the growing power of the Executive and the growing power of the governmental bureaus, but is it not a fact that we are slavishly dependent upon those bureaus today for information, for data, for advice, for guidance, for the very good reason that the Congress has no instrumentality or

weapon of its own for such information. How freely figures and statistics from Government agencies are quoted on this floor. How frequently bureau opinions are echoed. What about the accuracy and completeness of such opinions and statistics?

On the 7th of September the President said:

He may say that on other days in the future, and if he has the instrumentalities at his command and we do not, then there must be a constant growth of the Executive power and a diminution of the legislative power until that thing is corrected. That, in my judgment, is what is wrong with the Congress today. It is not the integrity or the morals of the Members, nor the intellectuality, it is not their lack of capacity for cooperation or their unawareness of present problems, it is not the lack of combativeness, it is not the injection of too much partisanship, it is not the thinking of the November elections, as we see it expressed in the press from time to time. The level of this Congress is the equal or higher, in my judgment, of many of the Congresses that have gone before, but until we equip, staff, and arm ourselves so that we can make a case for the legislative branch, then and only then will there be that proper independence of the legislative establishment and we can do the kind of job that is absolutely necessary and which is expected of this body.

The thing that is wrong with Congress is fear; not fear of lobbies, not fear of criticism, not fear of the dead cats that are thrown at us ever so often; it is a fear that I observed years ago of doing something for ourselves as an institution. It is a very natural apprehension, for when we do, we are often at the receiving end of a lot of spicy, derogatory comment that has a great deal of reader interest. It is interesting to read about free haircuts, which I have never seen since I have been in Washington; free mineral water, which is a myth; free trunks, which means one trunk to transport office files, and so forth; or about too much mileage, which is usually half enough to take a Member back and forth to his constituency to make a report from time to time, or about too much of a stationery allowance, which for many Congressmen is not enough. They do not tell the other side, of course, about telephone and telegraph bills that one pays out of his own pocket. I do not know what yours are, but mine was over \$100 this month and probably it will be \$150 when I get them all together from three offices. Those things are out of your own pocket. They do not tell about the fact that we pay an income tax out of our salaries, that the Bureau of Internal Revenue does not allow you for the expense of a residence in Washington, and it does not allow you to deduct for campaign expenses. The reasons those things are not written up is the fact that they do not make particularly interesting reading, but if they write something out about free haircuts and free mineral water, which does not exist as far as the

House of Representatives is concerned, they can always find a place on the front page.

Over the years I can understand the timidity, the fear, the apprehension that has developed when Congress does something for itself. The latest illustration, of course, was the pension proposition. I told some of the folks in the course of the primary campaign out there about this whole pension issue. I told them also that I consulted some life insurance representatives about these so-called pensions and found that most any standard life insurance company could do as well or better than the Government for the same amount of cash and annual premiums which must be paid. However, Congress was reproached for self-serving.

Those things, of course, make good reading, and we recoil at the idea, and so we are more and more reluctant to do something for ourselves. We do it for everybody else. Do you know that in the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress we have authorized or appropriated a little over \$150,000,000 for the operation of Government and for the war effort? That is the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress. How much did we appropriate for ourselves? We appropriated slightly over \$25,000,000, which is one six-thousandth of all we have authorized or appropriated this session of Congress for the operation of the legislative body, for supervision, for investigation, and for the general conduct of the Government insofar as we have the jurisdiction and authority. A pretty small amount, if you please. It is no wonder, then, when we give O. P. A. \$90,000,000, and take only \$25,000,000 for the Congress to police the activities of Government in the conduct of this huge establishment, and when we give the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs \$26,000,000, as much as we take for ourselves to operate this Government, that we ask, How are we going to police, supervise, check, and insure maximum efficiency in Government? It simply cannot be done. Congress as such is not doing its job today because it does not have the instrumentalities with which to do the job, and until it throws fear to the winds and staffs itself, it will not do the job of which it is capable.

Is it any wonder, then, that the bureaus have grabbed the ball and that we have become dependent upon them for information, data, and assistance? Is it so singular, then, that we do not function so well, when if there is a request for an appropriation by one of the bureaus of Government the only information we will get will be from those who are going to spend the money and administer that function? Is there any independence in that? Is there any self-assertiveness in that? I can find none. Now, while criticism and comment has been at its height, is certainly a very propitious time for a little action.

We are demanding audacious military action. We want some victories. We want to win the war. What do we see? General Somervell goes to St. Louis and makes a speech in which he says, "We are damn well losing the war." Admiral Morell goes to Toronto to make a speech

to a convention and scolds the public and everybody and says, "We are damn well losing the war." Ralph Bard, the Under Secretary of the Navy, goes to Cleveland to make a speech, and says "We are damn well losing the war." Elmer Davis, of O. W. I., gave out a release some months ago saying we could lose the war.

Why are we losing it? You give me an answer, if you will. We have provided funds and legislation. We have a substantial military force. We have a Navy. People are patriotically cooperating in every way. We are advised that production is in full swing. It is not enough to scold the country as an answer. It requires more than that and we should ascertain the real answer. There is a responsibility upon the Congress to make a constructive contribution and to equip itself to find what the answer is, and then to advise this country and to apply corrective measures.

We, as Members of Congress, demand supplies, production, equipment, and the facilities for victory, and, of course, the only information we can get is if we go down and ask Don Nelson how the battle on the home front is progressing.

We demand efficiency and elimination of waste, and so forth, but where are the facts unless we get them from the folks whom we charge with being the wasters? We want the facts about the war, but we are going to have to ask Elmer.

We believe in criticism, but we do not have an independent set of facts on which to base that criticism.

We demand the abolition of the non-essential functions of Government, but the very individuals who have to come and testify before a committee of Congress will be those who operate those nonessential functions, and they can think up 9,000 reasons why they are essential to Government operation.

I never was so intrigued in my lifetime as I was in connection with the hearings on the independent offices bill this year, along in December or January. The National Archives came before our committee and made out the most beautiful and persuasive case of how they were a war instrumentality. The Federal Trade Commission went back and dug out all of the stuff relative to the functions they performed during the first World War, and they said, "Now, we are a war agency." Every agency in Government will do it every time, and how are we going to test it unless we are staffed and equipped to look into that and see about this whole element of dispensibility?

There is going to be a vast problem of post-war reconstruction on the domestic front. A bill has been reported by the Committee on Labor known as the Voorhis bill for a National Planning Commission of 34 members, with 5 Senators, 5 Members of the House, and 24 other members. The bill states that a majority shall be a quorum, and business shall be done with a majority vote. So the legislative branch just gets a push in that bill, a little push downhill from the high ground of legislative independence.

In a little while there will be international proposals here. You think that is a guess? Let me prove to you that it is not a guess. Strangely enough this

seems to have escaped many of the commentators and those who dig out the things that are found in official reports.

In the fifth report on lend-lease operations, submitted to this Congress by the President on June 11, 1942, I read from page 22 as follows:

It is hoped that plans will soon develop for a series of agreements—

That means with the United Nations—and recommendations for legislation in the fields of commercial policy, of money and finance, international investment, and reconstruction.

They are probably in process of preparation now. One day they will be laid in the lap of Congress and the "must" tag will be put on them and there will be a deadline. Will we then be informed of the ramifications of these policies, of the commitments to which the people of the United States of America are to be obligated, the people for whose welfare we as a coordinate branch of the Government are responsible? How much information will we have? Exactly none, except from those who will have drawn the bills and who will have all the answers.

A great many problems will confront the country. There are four particular fields of endeavor in which we as a Congress ought to be prepared. First, we ought to be a constructive force in the prosecution of this war and in the achievement of victory. We ought to be making ourselves ready now for the post-war problems on the domestic front, because the bureaus are already doing so. Here is the latest release from the National Resources Planning Board. They say:

The demobilization of the armed forces of the Nation must be as carefully planned as their recruitment.

It is all laid out what they propose to do. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BERRY] has a bill in preparation to give the President \$75,000,000, to give the planning agencies \$25,000,000, and they will undertake to carry the ball as they have always done. The information we shall get will not be independent information but what we get from those who are going to spend the money and articulate those functions.

On yesterday a release was issued by the Federal Works Agency stating that the first actual engineering work on post-war public construction is well under way. It relates to a highway-building program to cost nearly \$500,000,000.

The public works reserve of the Federal Works Agency has also been working in this field for some time, cataloging potential projects and preparing for a future program.

Then there is this whole field of supervision of appropriation and expenditure and, finally, there are the peace problems. The time has come to talk about it; everybody else is talking about it. The National Resources Planning Board, which is in the executive office, talks about it because they state, on page 1 of their latest brochure, issued in September 1942:

To win the peace, we must prepare now, even while we are concentrating on winning the war.

The executive agencies are discussing it. It is time the legislative branch should be discussing it, because it is going to require preparation. The people must be prepared and we must be prepared. So there is a fertile field of endeavor for us in which we ought to be equipped.

Then in the prosecution of the war I quite agree with what William Hard wrote in the Reader's Digest. Look what we have. Military affairs legislation goes to the Military Affairs Committee, military appropriations to the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations, naval-affairs legislation to the Naval Affairs Committee, naval appropriations to the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations and some of them to the Deficiency Subcommittee. This makes five on the House side, and in the Senate it is the same thing, so there are five more. Then, in addition, we have the Truman committee, we have the May investigating committee, and we have the Vinson investigating committee.

Is it any wonder we are charged with dereliction when they count up the score and say Don Nelson has been up here 14 times in 15 months and Knudsen 13 times and Bill Batt 12 times? So they say, Why the lag, the lost motion, and the inefficiency? Something ought to be done about it. There ought to be a continuous check-up, and we ought to have an answer for this constant scolding of the public as to losing the war. If lost motion and the prolixities of congressional procedure are at fault, the responsibility is ours to correct it and devise streamlined techniques that will facilitate the war effort.

There is going to be a conference soon, and I shall ask why we are losing. Maybe I will not get an answer, but one of the gentlemen who made a statement to the public that "You damn well know we are losing the war" will be there, and I am going to ask why, and ask also for an answer, because it is not enough for high functionaries of this Government to go over the country and scold and say we are losing without telling us the reason for it, so that we may find a corrective and a remedy.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. A Navy man made that statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. An Army man as well as a Navy man. Mr. Bard made it, likewise General Somervell and Admiral Moreell.

Then, of course, there is the necessity for a general check on operations of Government for which we appropriate. Think of the magnitude of this Government business. Two hundred million dollars for travel, \$13,000,000 to run an information bureau, illegal commitments made by the Farm Security Administration for \$16,000,000 that the Comptroller's Office would not approve. Over-staffed bureaus! A high official of Government told me just a day or two ago, when we were talking about one agency, "They have so many people over there they fall over themselves; if they had 20 percent less, maybe they would get some work done." The Home Owners' Loan Corporation, in my judgment, ought to be liquidated. Then there is that huge Central Valley project in California



where the Pacific Electric Co. was willing to supply service in close proximity thereto and return a profit to the Government, and yet we appropriate the money for it, and not a single member of the committee has been out there to see what goes on.

I can give you my personal experience along that line to show you that we are operating on a sort of glorified quiz-program basis. The Rural Electrification Administration officials came before our subcommittee a few years ago and then the following year when they came I just happened to remember that it did not seem that the information dovetailed; it just did not harmonize. I went back and dug out the old records. I thought that this was a matter that needed attention, and it got attention, but it took me 2 years to get the head of the information service fired, to get one in the personnel branch of that agency suspended and to get the Assistant Administrator reprimanded. I had to use the Secretary of Agriculture and to insist that he use his investigation staff. Letters by the bushel changed hands, all over a personnel matter that involved only \$134,000. It took 2 years to get that kind of disciplinary action. Why? Because we are constantly fishing with the bureaus and we put on a great quiz program, and they tell us what they think we ought to know and not a great deal more. How can the Augean stables be cleansed unless we are equipped and staffed to secure basic information?

Do you think the legislative branch of the Government can function independently and properly with the kind of prestige it ought to enjoy on that kind of a basis? The Congress today, in my judgment, needs a great, big dose of B. in the form of a staff or an instrumentality so we can make out a case after gathering information and rebut cases that are so often presented to us.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is making a very interesting statement, as he always does. I would inquire if he does not agree with me that the trouble with Congress has been that it has not quite lived up to, or that its experience has been that it has not lived up to, the level of the oath that the Members took to uphold and support the Constitution of the United States? In other words, that it has been prone to do business on its knees, rather than on its feet, forgetting that it is a coordinate branch of the Government, that has been governed more by fears than it has by understanding, that it has lived too much in the shadow, and not enough in the sunshine, that the Members have found it too easy to be pushed around like wooden men on a checkerboard, that, like dead seaweed, it has too often drifted with the tide.

Mr. DIRKSEN. O, Mr. Speaker, I could not agree with these general observations. I cannot put it on a personal basis. We are all parts of a collective instrumentality. I do agree that we have placed ourselves in the position of supplicants with the executive branch instead

of maintaining complete prestige as a coordinate branch of Government.

Mr. COX. And that there has been too little independence upon the part of Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I said earlier in my observations that we recoil from doing things for ourselves, because we have found that every time something has been done for the Congress, there has been a kind of attack and reproach. This is not said in a spirit of pique. If, however, the proposal which I shall presently present has merit, I trust that every commentator who has chided Congress for its derelictions will with equal vigor lend a hand in developing public support for an implementing of that same Congress with effective tools.

I want to get to the remedy. I propose to submit to this House four separate and distinct proposals, and the first one will go into the hopper at the end of my speech today, in the form of a concurrent resolution. I suppose I should have begun with the war matter first, but I am still collecting some additional information before finally completing that resolution and setting it out to my own satisfaction.

But I do not want the time to go by, and so today I shall point out what I think is the way out, and I do it on the basis of my service as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and of the difficulties encountered in season and out to make the kind of case that we want to in the interest of good government, and in the interest of efficiency, in the interest of economy, and in the interest of fairness to the people who send us here, and who pay the taxes with which to operate this huge structure.

So today I begin with a proposal to staff the Congress to meet the reconstruction and the planning problem. There is another reason for beginning with it. The Voorhis bill has been reported out and is on the calendar; the Beiter bill will go into the hopper soon and there was a bill on this floor a few months ago dealing with planning, public works, and reconstruction. I helped to kill it, because I disagreed with it, and I am more persuaded than ever that that action was right, because if there is going to be a planning, if there is to be reconstruction, if there is to be a broad policy on which the legislative branch must pass, then the legislative branch must be armed and staffed so as to go into the executive agencies, and make independent investigations in the field, and assemble all of the data that are necessary on which to predicate some kind of a reasonable and intelligent judgment on present and post-war planning and public-works projects.

What are these problems? When the conflict is over, of course, there will be a huge Army to be demobilized, and then there will be a demand for full employment and employment projects. There is the problem of the reconversion of industry. When the war is over the automobile business must be reconverted to its peacetime pursuits. There will be many other industries with a similar problem. There will be all sorts of plan-

ning programs, and many Federal, State, and local projects, and then there will be the old story of how much to appropriate and for what. It will be right back in our laps, like it has been for years and years. Then there will come this story. Are we going to have a repetition of some of the things that happened yesteryear, or will we be armed in advance with reports, data, information, field investigations, and records with which to work? Do not you remember some of those projects—a million-dollar race track at Del Mar, Calif., that was turned over to Bing Crosby's brother? Are we going to have \$125,000 cow barns like the one at the University of Louisiana? Are we going to make it possible to build a four-story \$125,000 hen house at the Soldiers' Home in Washington, D. C.? Are we going to have other projects like rat-catching projects at \$2.97 a rat on the wharves of New Orleans? Are we going to have a \$220,000 writers' project in California? Are we going to have instances where they go out and buy 824 axes to chop down 50 trees? All this is in the hearings; it is a matter of fact; it is documented information. My friends and colleagues, the time to prepare is now. The time to get ready, the time to go out and make a survey and get facts in advance and not afterward. It is now. We have been content so often here to vote the money and have it expended, and then we get a report, and then we speechify on the subject, but it does not do a bit of good.

Thus far, our technique has been in the manner of a post mortem rather than a diagnosis before the operation takes place.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE. Is it not true that every time power is taken from the State governments and lodged in the Federal Government, that power does not go to the legislative branch, but rather to the executive branch?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, definitely so.

Mr. GWYNNE. Is not the real remedy, getting right down to the base, to return a lot of those powers to the States where they belong? Is not that the remedy for a lot of this trouble?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; but we are dealing with a condition, not a theory. This is going to happen. It is a question of whether or not we are going to assert our independence as a legislative body and find out what these bureaus are actually doing and make them perform under the standards and the guidance that is laid down by the Congress, or are we going to be diverted once more from the main issue and then finally let the bureaus carry the ball?

Mr. GWYNNE. I agree with your statement as far as you go.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I realize that is an element in it, but we are dealing with an existing structure, and am trying to find something within the structure whereby we can implement our own prestige and better discharge our own responsibilities. Now, after all, the most important thing about it is the plan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?  
Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Does not the gentleman believe that we could simplify our problem by demobilizing, to a great extent, the bureaucracy we have set up?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think very definitely, but the thesis that I have tried to lay down this afternoon is that through fear of public reproach we have in the years failed to staff and implement ourselves as a coordinate agency of government, and until we do we are not going to be able to do a real job and find out what is going on. That would embrace the problem of decentralizing government.

Now, how to cure it: I have attempted a diagnosis and wish to propose a remedy. Here is proposal No. 1 in the field of post-war planning, reconstruction, and general planning for relief and work-relief, employment projects and related activities. It is a concurrent resolution. It sets up a joint committee of the House and Senate on planning and reconstruction. Under that committee it sets up a congressional planning and reconstruction service within the Congress itself, solely and exclusively responsible to the Congress, and to no other agency. There will be a director and an assistant director. They will be chosen on the basis of fitness, without any consideration for political affiliations. They will be authorized to hire experts, consultants, engineers, investigators, contractors, auditors—all types of personnel that may be necessary to do a real job. They must have familiarity with relief, work-relief, the building of structures, highways, housing; and State and local governments, since there is constant participation. They would have expert knowledge on public power, airports, and social trends. We hear so much of social aspects and we ought to have somebody in our own structure to advise on these subjects. They will serve as a liaison between the Congress and the joint committee and agencies of government. They shall be authorized to make investigations on the feasibility of projects. They shall catalog and make recommendations on classifications and types. They would analyze reports that come to us and see where the bugs and weaknesses are, and whether they are complete and accurate. They would study unemployment problems in their relation to public works. They would make not only investigations in Washington, but make them in the field. One of the genuine weaknesses of the legislative branch is that it is not equipped with an instrument for investigating activities in the field.

Consider my own difficulty as a member of the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations. We provide \$20,000,000 or more for Soil Conservation Service, \$100,000,000 for the Farm Security Administration, millions for the Forest Service, and one must take departmental estimates with a big dose of faith, for there is no agency of Congress today which makes a check-up in the field on the activities and functions for which

public funds are expended to determine how efficacious those operations are conducted.

How are we going to find time from a multitude of duties to go out and take a look and see what they are doing? We have to see through the eyes of the agency that belongs to us as a Congress and is exclusively responsible to us. We say to them, "Go out and see what they are doing and come back and report. If they have 100 men and can do it with 50, let us know about it. If their techniques are faulty, let us know about it."

How else can we be informed on the magnitude and diversity of the operations of the country?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then these experts would sit with the committees of Congress. There is nothing so discouraging as to have all the folks from one agency of Government lined up on one side of the appropriations committee table and the subcommittee over on this side, and then you start to cross-examine. It is just like pulling teeth. You do not get full information. You cannot in the nature of things. Again there is the element of time and the limitations on physical energy. All of a Congressman's time could be devoted to a single major activity and yet here are literally hundreds of such activities on which we pass at each session. It is noteworthy that the very agency that is going to spend the money makes up the estimate in September; the spenders make up the estimate. Then they take it to the Budget Bureau. Two or three or four Members are assigned, and they look it over. They blue-pencil it. They haul the agency back. There is some testimony. Then they look it over again, and finally it is gotten ready to incorporate in a great big 1,000-page catalog known as the Budget of the United States. It goes to the President. The Budget message comes up. Bills come along with it, and there we sit fishing and cross-examining and trying to find out about the operations of this Government. I tell you that too often it is a pretty discouraging and dismal affair. It is like trying a lawsuit without witnesses and without evidence.

There ought to be a man at one's elbow who has spent a year in an agency, who has become intimately familiar with its processes, who knows all about it and who will serve as a counsel to your committee, who will cross-examine, who will rebut and expertly analyze the testimony the agency puts in. Then you begin to get the story and find out what it is all about.

In this concurrent resolution which sets up the first of four proposals which I intend to submit for your consideration and disposition I ask for \$1,000,000 for the Congressional Planning and Reconstruction Service to implement the Con-

gress' effort. Too much? Maybe it ought to be \$2,000,000, though when the others come along there will be other millions, and that is the time when the element of fear which has restrained us from doing for ourselves must be shaken away, for unless we are staffed and implemented and fortified with that investigatory staff we are not going to discharge our responsibility to the people and to this great governmental structure.

So, answering the query with which I started: What is wrong with Congress? It is not implemented; it is not staffed; it does not have the weapons with which to do the best kind of job. So I say to you now: Let us spend a little money on ourselves; let us provide legislative tools to get the facts, the data, the information, and then control, supervise, and survey the operations of the Government. We do not allocate to ourselves the authority and the prerogatives of the Commander in Chief; it is his business to conduct the war, but it is our business to be aware, and to be alert, and to find out for the people of the country the answer to this question now being pounded over the air waves and from platforms: "We are damn well losing the war." I want to know the answer to that and the answer to many other problems, and I can think of no more effective method to discharge our full responsibility than to secure the instruments with which to obtain data and information that is so necessary to our tasks.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I just want to say to the gentleman that as an illustration of the lack of information which faces the membership we may simply take the tax bill. The Joint Committee on Taxation should have a staff sufficient to analyze all the proposals that come from the Treasury and to act on their own figures rather than being obliged to accept those given by the Treasury.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As a colleague of the gentleman from Illinois on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Independent Offices I want to say to the Membership that the gentleman from Illinois, despite the handicaps of the present system, is one of the most able in digging out facts that we have on the committee, even barring none of the majority side of the committee. As the gentleman has said, with the subcommittee sitting on one side of the table dealing with the personnel of an agency sitting on the other side of the table with its staff that has devoted itself for the whole year to preparing Budget estimates and justifying them, the committee is at a decided disadvantage. You sit there on your side of the table and go from one agency to another.

I understand that originally the Budget Bureau was supposed to be an agency of the Congress, but the Executive has taken it over. Congress should adopt a



program such as that outlined by my distinguished colleague.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman wonders why high-ranking military and naval officers should state that we are losing the war. I have an answer for that. They themselves are not capable of putting this war over and are not producing the materials they tell us they are producing. I can show the gentleman plant after plant that has not produced a plane yet and will not produce a plane in 6 months.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I just wish to observe that there is a case where we ought to know why. You cannot chide the military authorities of the country on an unsupported statement. We must know the reason and the facts.

Mr. LESINSKI. Before the gentleman passes judgment I should like to add that I know of plant after plant where labor has been accused of sabotaging by laying down on the job. It is not labor; it is the administration of the plants and the foremen.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. As the ranking minority member of the committee to watch public expenditures which was set up with a great deal of fanfare to do a lot of good, I want to say that the majority has always stifled any sort of investigation and we could find out nothing because the majority did not want it to be told. I do not believe it would help much if we were staffed and implemented, although I am enthusiastic almost in favor of what the gentleman proposes. I have pleaded for similar action for years.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know the gentleman has.

Mr. GIFFORD. How can we be effective even though we are staffed and implemented if those people are controlled the same way people have been controlled that I have tried to get before my committee? While I say the way the gentleman proposes is the way to do it, yet I ask what hope have we that it will be effective?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In this connection let me observe that under the British parliamentary system the Committee on Expenditures is always in control of the minority party, whichever it is. This may be a suggestion.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman will recall that frequently in our Committee on Appropriations members of both parties

have suggested some of the remedies the gentleman from Illinois today has suggested.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. It is time for action.

Mr. STEFAN. In the gentleman's resolution he suggests a joint committee of the House and the Senate. This is a good recommendation, for I believe it would eliminate a tremendous amount of inefficiency and bring about greater agreement on the part of appropriating committees of both the bodies, for frequently the Senate Committee on Appropriations will so alter a House appropriation bill that when it comes back to us it is unrecognizable.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe it would eliminate a lot of waste motion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may proceed for 1 additional minute in order that I may ask a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just wanted to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] who charges management for being to blame for lack of production if he will put in the RECORD sometime within the next month, say, the names and the circumstances where management has hindered production.

Mr. LESINSKI. Is that a request?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman believe it would be helpful if we followed a system whereby Cabinet members could be required to appear before our committees? I have in mind particularly our own Committee on Foreign Affairs. We have had innumerable prime ministers from foreign countries receive information even about our own country from foreign emissaries, but people in our own country, our own State Department, did not appear before us. A joint hearing it would seem to me would be invaluable in that respect.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe so.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TREADWAY. When the gentleman summarizes his whole proposition, does he not get down to the point that there should be a closer relationship between the legislative part of the Government and the administrative part?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely so.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is it not a fact that what the gentleman is endeavoring to secure is for the administrative part instead of confiding in its own department to confide in the legislative department as it should, if such resolution as the gentleman suggests is adopted?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Plus an intimate knowledge on the part of the legislative branch of the whole structure of Government and its operations.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. How is the gentleman going to control, through this organization which he proposes, the human frailty of Congress of voting large appropriations for pet projects and all sorts of expenditures, then refusing to pass the necessary taxes to pay for these expenditures?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not recognize that human frailty, I may say to the gentleman from Ohio. I think that is a very natural corollary and result of the fact we have gotten bogged down by being unarmed and unequipped to get information and in proportion as we do and spread that before the Congress I think we can do a good job, after which these little bits of selfishness that may have been manifested heretofore will sort of go by the board. I lay emphasis on the appointment of a director, assistant director, and staff of this fact-finding and investigating agency solely on grounds of fitness and without regard to political affiliations. This is essential.

I appreciate the indulgence of the membership. At an early date I hope to submit three other proposals for your consideration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### INFLATION AND PRICE CONTROL

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on September 7 the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, came before Congress and broadcast a message charging that the Congress was to blame for not passing measures which would control and prevent inflation. It will be remembered that in November 1941, when the alleged price control bill was under consideration, after consultation with Mr. Bernard Baruch, who had charge of the price control operations in the 1917-19 period, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] offered an amendment which would have controlled the price of wages and farm products.

It was perfectly apparent at that time that this was absolutely necessary if inflation was to be prevented, or even slowed down.

The President of the United States was opposed to that amendment! He wanted the privilege of juggling the price of labor upward, and he wanted to do it for political effect. He tells us now that it was necessary to raise the price of labor to meet the increased price of farm products which had come upon us. The reverse is true. The raising of the price of labor by Mr. Roosevelt is what has caused the increase in prices that has resulted. It was not because the farmers of the Nation were not going to cooperate in the war effort that the Senate included a provision that no limitation should be placed upon the price of farm products below parity, but because the reservation to the President of the right to juggle the price of wages put the farmer in a position where his costs were bound to go up.

And so, from the 29th of January, when the so-called price control bill became effective, the President, through the

operations of the War Labor Board as to the factories, and of Madam Perkins as to the millions of employees upon projects being put up by the Government, has so raised the price of labor that it has destroyed any possibility of controlling inflation.

The price of commodities has gone up as a result of the inflation which the President himself has promoted. In other words, the President himself has been responsible for the promotion of inflation, and now, in order to cover up and camouflage this effort he has come before the Congress and asked us to fix the price of all commodities, including farm commodities, definitely, and to permit him to continue to juggle the price of labor when in section 4 of the House bill he reserves the right to raise wages 15 percent in certain cases and where in section 5, lines 17 to 21, he reserves the right to raise wages to any extent.

I could not be a party to fixing the price of commodities and at the same time not fixing the price of labor. The two things must go together or we are bound to have inflation. No sorrier spectacle has ever been presented to the American people than the misrepresentations of what this bill is and what it does than has resulted from the President's message and the articles that have followed.

The President has deliberately promoted inflation. He has tried to make the Congress the goat. I, for my own part, refuse to be the goat.

I supported the Gore amendment, which was offered in November. I myself offered an amendment to the current bill which would absolutely freeze and fix prices as of August 15, when it was under consideration in the House, and I supported that amendment. I supported an amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], which would have frozen prices of everything as of December 8, 1941, the day war was declared. I supported an amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] to fix prices as of September 23, 1942. Those were the four opportunities to vote against inflation. I supported each of them and shall support any other real attempt to stop it. I will not be a party to a fraud upon the American people and the American farmer.

I believe that the farmer and the workingman are just as willing as any other citizen to do their part toward preventing inflation.

I know that in my district farmers who have been operating their farms successfully for 30 and 40 years have been obliged to close up their farms and sell off their dairy cattle because, due to the inflation that the President has promoted, they are no longer able to hire and secure the help required to keep going. I hear of the same situation all over the country.

The conduct of the war effort and the possibility of maintaining our food supplies have been hampered very much by the President's promotion of inflation and by his sponsorship of the type of bill that has been under consideration here and in the Senate.

Will the President ever quit fooling around and trying to play politics, and get down to supporting the war effort? I call upon him to do so now.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from an associated Hungarian weekly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

#### THE POLL TAX

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, on October 12, a motion will be called up to discharge the Rules Committee from consideration of a bill purporting to repeal the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in the several States of the United States.

It is my information that there are only eight States in the Union making the payment of a poll tax a prerequisite to the privilege of voting. The States of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia have the so-called poll tax as a prerequisite to voting. In each of these States every dollar collected as a poll tax contributes to the support of public education. In Alabama the tax is \$1.50 per year and must be paid from the twenty-first to the forty-fifth birthday of the voter.

I will not touch on the constitutionality of this legislation for this subject has already been ably presented by the Honorable Abram P. Staples, attorney general of Virginia, and placed in the RECORD by Senator BYRD on September 22, 1942. The constitutional provisions referred to and the cases cited by the able attorney general clearly show the unconstitutionality of this legislation.

My reasons for opposing the proposed bill are based entirely on the question of invading States' rights. Today we are engaged in the bloodiest war of all history. It is our belief that we are fighting this war for the protection of democracy and to insure the right of the people of other nations to be governed as they see fit and protect them from aggression from without. After the war we will have the greatest opportunity for world leadership any democracy has ever had. If we have the vision, the intelligent leadership, and the willingness to respect the local institutions and the rights of other nations to conduct their own governments as they see fit and, at the same time, to see to it that they respect the rights of sister nations, we will be largely responsible for world peace, but if we attempt to force our views of democracy on other nations, we will be laying the foundation for another war that, in all probability, will destroy civilization. Democracy in New England is vastly different from democracy in the far West; democracy in the New York area has lit-

tle in common with democracy as we know it in the South. Yet, with these varied interpretations of democracy, the Congress has recognized these differences and has amalgamated them into a national democracy that has worked for over 150 years. Recognition by the Congress of the varied conceptions of democracy has enabled us to become the greatest agricultural and industrial Nation on earth. Today, as never before, democracy in this country is faced with its greatest peril. The rights of our States, held sacred by our ancestors, have gradually been encroached upon by the Federal Government, and today there are few functions of State governments that have not been encroached upon by Federal bureaucracy.

Whether one likes it or not, 32 States in our country have head taxes and a person must pay this tax whether or not he votes. I might not like this method of taxation, but it is not any of my business, coming from Alabama, to say that the people of Massachusetts do not have the right to levy such a tax. Some States nominate Members of Congress by convention instead of by popular ballot. I might not like this procedure but if it suits the people of Connecticut why should I interest myself in their local affairs. If the so-called Geyer-Pepper bill is constitutional, then we who have primary elections could say to the people of Connecticut and other States that nominate Members of Congress by convention that from now on they must nominate all Federal officials by popular vote. Some of our large cities prefer to exercise their democracy through a political machine dominated by a so-called boss. The Representatives in Congress from many of those cities must at all times vote the will of the so-called boss or they cannot be reelected. We Alabamians do not prefer to exercise our democracy in that way, but if it is agreeable to the people of those cities dominated by political machines why should we Alabamians attempt to force our views of democracy upon them. To do so would destroy the very principles of democracy.

I might not like the 40-mile speed limit in the State of Maryland or the levying of tolls to cross bridges in other States, but if the people of those States like these regulations that is their business and not mine. Some States levy what is known as a road tax and every able-bodied man between certain ages must pay this tax or be subjected to criminal punishment. If we believe in local government we cannot attempt to impose our views on the road tax on those States having them, even though the tax might be considered obnoxious by us. We must, of necessity, respect the rights of the people of different States and if we do not, sooner or later, our States will cease to exist. After destroying the control of the States over their elections it would be easy to then require the representatives in the House and Senate to be elected from the United States at large.

By the same token it would be possible to persecute by legislative act any religious sect or any minority group, for if we destroy our Constitution by destroy-



ing our States there will be no rights left except those granted by acts of Congress, and in a few years some tyrant will seize control of our Government and take from the people the right to elect representatives.

I note that certain pressure groups have exerted every possible pressure on Members of the House and Senate to repeal the poll tax. These groups, in many instances, have interested themselves in sabotaging our preparedness program. They have no particular interest in our democratic form of government; they have no interest in private enterprise, but would gladly welcome the fall of our democratic institutions. These groups compose a small minority of our population now, and the same Constitution that protects the rights of the States to prescribe qualifications for the voter protects them in their activities; but if we destroy our States' rights and destroy our Constitution, these minority groups might not, under some future government of our country, be accorded any rights or privileges. The end that they are seeking now might destroy their very existence in the future.

For over 150 years our country has struggled to keep away from racial and religious hatred. We have been the most tolerant nation on earth. Now, as never before, we need to strengthen that tolerant attitude instead of destroying it.

This bill contains the seeds of destruction. After this terrible carnage is over and most of our boys in the armed forces come back and find themselves without jobs, and millions of our war workers are deprived of their weekly pay envelope, it will be easy for some bigot to rise to leadership. What will be the natural course? Some one must be made the scapegoat to justify the rise of any tyrant. All history records that minority groups are the easiest groups to be made the scapegoat. Many of those who are agitating this legislation come from minority groups or are catering to them. If they do not have the foresight to think of the terrible repercussions that will follow this war, we in Congress should forget for a moment that we are seeking votes and should crush this seed of destruction before the beast gets out of our hands and devours the last vestiges of democracy.

It is needless to review the tactics that were used to bring this bill to the floor. Every form of prejudice and sectional hatred was resorted to. I wonder who can charge that the Representatives from the poll-tax States are inferior to Representatives from other States. These poll-tax States during the last 10 years have given to the country as Speakers of the House of Representatives Hon. John Garner, of Texas, Hon. Joseph W. Byrns, of Tennessee, Hon. William B. Bankhead, of Alabama, and our present distinguished Speaker, Hon. Sam Rayburn, of Texas. For 8 years Hon. John N. Garner, of Texas, was Vice President. Today in the House of Representatives and Senate many chairmen of important committees are from the so-called poll-tax States. Can anyone challenge their patriotism and loyalty to our democratic institutions? Who can challenge their

ability or their integrity? What States have Representatives in the Congress who are less controlled by political bosses, capitalists, or any of the so-called pressure groups?

Before we cast a vote on this piece of legislation, let us examine, with a view to the welfare of our country and the future of democracy, the dangers that lie ahead.

#### SECRET INSPECTION TRIPS OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the White House has just announced the return of the President to Washington after an extensive tour of western and mid-western sections of the country. So, now, an important news item which has been suppressed for 2 weeks can be given to the country and what is more, the door is now open for a full and free discussion as to whether this sort and degree of censorship is either necessary or desirable.

My own view of it is that no one can challenge a censorship or a secrecy which is necessary for the protection of the safety of the President of the United States. I would be the last man to urge any publicity that might endanger the President; so I can well understand why the itinerary followed on the trip is not given, why advance notice as to the time and place where the President might be has not been made public and should not have been made public; but, at the same time the censorship in this particular case went much beyond that. It went so far as to preclude any mention of the fact that the trip was being made or any mention by any paper, say in the city of Detroit, of the fact that the President had been there, even though his presence became known to literally thousands of people. Further, one may inquire, in view of those circumstances whether it is proposed to set a precedent which will permit lesser administrators to conceal activities which should be open to the press and the radio and thus to the people. May I express the fervent hope that no such precedent is established.

It seems a little strange to me that these alleged inspection trips of the President always seem to occur just before the elections come along. I remember a drought inspection trip that was made out into the Middle West in my country a few years ago and, if I remember the trip correctly, they had about 5 minutes of drought inspection and 5 days of parade. I am led to inquire whether or not this trip may not have had something of the same character and I rather suspect it has. I hazard the guess here now that the people of this country would much rather have the President stay on the job of winning the war instead of mixing into the politics of the country.

At least, I think that was a very obvious reaction after the President undertook to inject himself into the Gov-

ernorship contest in the State of New York.

I further hazard the guess that when the details of this last trip are made known and are given to the public, the political implications will be plainly discernible in much of what was done. I think the people may well question whether the trip was advisable and whether any necessary or helpful or useful thing has been accomplished by it; and that without regard to the desirability of the censorship involved.

Finally, may I say this: Prominent officials who make news have as distinct a responsibility in the censorship of that news as those who disseminate the news, perhaps a greater responsibility. In this case, the President himself, according to Arthur Krock of the New York Times in his article yesterday, refused to permit the papers or radio to mention any facts involved, and this over the strenuous objection of many of his advisors who ought to know something about the extent to which censorship should go. Millions of persons throughout the United States were aware of the facts, and I am reliably informed that many of them have berated the newspapers for allegedly suppressing the news because of their supposed anti-administration bias. This is decidedly unfair to the newspapers and to the radio. In common fairness to them, the President should at the earliest possible moment issue a statement assuming full responsibility for suppression of the facts and commending the newspapers and the radio for their cooperation with the administration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### A SALUTE TO GEORGE BATES AND HIS FAMILY

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly to salute one of our colleagues on the patriotic contribution he and the members of his family are making to our war effort. It is not necessary to elaborate on the able services rendered in this body by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], a member of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, but I doubt that the Members know that just a few weeks back his son-in-law gave his life in the battle for the Solomons. Today three of his sons are in the service of Uncle Sam, in the Army and in the Navy. Next Tuesday his second daughter becomes a member of the Waves. I know you join me in this salute to the Bates family.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. RICHARDS, for 1 week, on account of illness in his family.

#### OIL SHORTAGE IN NEW ENGLAND

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt the House is tired of hearing me speak of the case of New England versus the Government and the eastern seaboard versus the Government in the matter of oil. I have maintained that if we had a single head on whom we could place the responsibility for obtaining a just distribution of oil we would have much better results. I have stated frequently that I believe Mr. Ickes and Mr. Eastman have done much in that respect, but they have not done enough.

As the matter stands today, it is very easy for one department to say, "We cannot do that because another department has not agreed to it, or the oil people will not agree to it, or somebody else will not agree to it." They do not have the power to act. There should be a responsible head who can and will act.

In one recent week—the week ending September 12—New England received only 70 percent of its usual daily supply of oil, whereas the rest of the eastern seaboard received 90 percent. I have been given 3 different reports or 3 different excuses as to why New England did not receive its fair share of oil. We had been promised more tank cars and more oil; instead we received less. I understand the week ending September 19 will show New England has received an even lower percentage.

I am tired of talking about this matter but I am very much more tired of being given promises that are not realized. Promises and directives do not give us oil for New England. Promises and directives do not keep us warm. Promises and directives do not keep our industries running.

Only 2 days ago the Secretary of the Interior issued a directive which would provide for the pooling of resources for oil and receiving that oil at certain terminals. If that directive is not put into force at once, we shall have great suffering in New England. Remember, New England has early and severe cold. These trainloads of many tank cars should be coming from the sources of supply immediately, and the oil should be unloaded and put into our tanks, and the tank cars released for the return trips to the source of supply.

The situation that exists today is entirely indefensible, and in the years to come history will show that this is the most unjust and discriminatory thing that has ever happened in peacetime or in war to any loyal section of the country.

I ask the Members of the House to help me in this matter, especially those of you who have not suffered from this injustice. There is only one way we can be relieved and kept warm during the winter, and that is by immediate action.

Apparently the O. P. C. has acted in the matter of coal, and a great deal of coal is on hand for the present, but I do not know whether that will be available as the winter proceeds. I do not know whether they are going to have the men

to mine the coal. I do not know whether the transportation facilities will hold up.

If last spring the Government had sent tankloads of oil to New England and to the east coast we would be in a perfectly safe position, not only so far as our industries are concerned but so far as the health of our people is concerned. I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that today there is a shortage of beds in the hospitals. There is a shortage of nurses and of doctors. How can people keep well if they do not have the necessary warmth? And it will be impossible to get enough medical attention. Public-health officials have begged people to keep well. We are a thickly populated and highly industrialized area. I shudder to think of the results of an epidemic of flu, not as a matter of health but as a matter of preserving manpower to win the war.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TREADWAY. My colleague has made a very deep study of this subject. Can she offer some very definite idea as to how the conditions in New England can be cured at the present time?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; I know the great interest my colleague has taken in this matter. By the immediate transportation of oil by tank cars in the proposed trainloads of 60 tank cars, and by the use of all the barges possible and tank trucks, and by the immediate pooling of the resources at the terminals for delivery of oil so there can be an immediate turn around when the oil cars come into those terminals. Some other steps will be needed which I cannot mention here at the moment, and, of course, immediate completion of pipe lines.

Mr. TREADWAY. Does the gentlewoman consider that that is being carried out to the best of the ability of the authorities?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No; I do not. In view of what might have been done, I do not think that to date nearly enough has been done. I think the whole thing is entirely indefensible and inexcusable. It remains to be seen whether those in authority do all they can from now on. If they do not, I can never have faith in them again.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Better than a month ago all shipment of gasoline in tank cars was stopped west of the Allegheny Mountains. More than 70,000 tank cars were taken out of the Middle West to supply oil and gasoline to the East. I am very much surprised to hear that the New England States have not received their share of the oil that was supposed to have come into all the Eastern States to give relief for this winter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand that exceptions to certain regulations were made which permitted 12,000 tank cars to be used to carry gasoline into certain States of the West.

Some 12,000 cars that were supposed to be used for the relief of New England as a matter of fact carried gasoline and other things to the farming areas in some of the Western States.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That does not apply to our section. We are, however, getting some gasoline and oil by pipe line.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will not give the gentleman the exact situation on the floor, but I will talk with him later and tell him exactly where I understand gasoline was carried by the tank cars that were supposed to go to New England. I have that information from authoritative sources. It has not been denied.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Of course, we have the same situation with reference to oil in the Northwest as obtains in the New England States. We must have oil because the thermometer goes down to 30 or 45 degrees below zero there for many weeks during the winter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes. It is inexcusable that that oil should not have been transported earlier where it is needed.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes; when you consider that most of the oil-producing areas of the United States are now running under a check on production and that there is an abundance of oil if they would only transport it to the places where it is needed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There is much more oil than is needed in the United States, and there has been terrible bungling and terrible mismanagement in not bringing about a proper distribution of it.

Today in my district an industry is being given an Army and Navy E pennant. That industry went into war production even before Pearl Harbor. Those workers loved their country so much that they have worked loyally, tirelessly, and have made every hour count in their production for winning the war. New Englanders are like that. The least that can be done is to keep them warm.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found, truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 346. Joint resolution extending for two months the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under the acts of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205), and June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 241).

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on Wednesday, September 30, 1942, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7164. An act to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the relief and benefits provided therein to certain persons, to include certain additional proceedings and



transactions therein, to provide further relief for persons in military service, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 2, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives will hold hearings beginning Tuesday, October 13, 1942, at 10 a. m., in the Committee Room, 1015 House Office Building, on H. R. 7620, a bill to provide for adjusting royalties for the use of inventions for the benefit of the United States, and for other purposes.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1945. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on lists of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1946. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the Office for Emergency Management, Office of War Information, in the sum of \$26,990,000, for the fiscal year 1943 (H. Doc. No. 862); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1947. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the Office for Emergency Management, Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, in the sum of \$5,500,000, for the fiscal year 1943 (H. Doc. No. 863); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1948. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the emergency fund for the President, amounting to \$25,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 864); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1949. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to \$34,920 (H. Doc. No. 865); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1950. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the Office of Civilian Defense, for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to \$1,042,000 (H. Doc. No. 866); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1951. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the War Manpower Commission for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to \$17,166,000 (H. Doc. No. 867); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1952. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to aid in the conservation of rubber by the prohibition of speeding; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 7629. A bill to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to expedite the war effort by providing for releasing officers and men for duty at sea and their replacement by women in the shore establishment of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 7630. A bill to provide additional personnel for civilian defense activities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 7631. A bill to provide for protection by war damage insurance of leasehold interests in property; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. R. 7632. A bill to provide that during the present war payments with respect to any crop of sugar beets or sugarcane shall not be subject to deductions on account of the employment of children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDMISTON:

H. R. 7633. A bill to increase the pay and allowances of members of the Army Nurse Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Planning and Reconstruction, a Congressional Planning and Reconstruction Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PACE:

H. Res. 547. Resolution authorizing an investigation of commodity prices; to the Committee on Rules.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1942

Rev. Richard M. Mussen, pastor, Sherwood Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, in these days of struggle and strife, when we share the destinies of freemen everywhere, be with our Nation and lead her in the way of liberty and truth.

Bless richly the President of these United States and all those who share with him the burdens and privileges of government.

Guide the President of the Senate and each Member of it, as they face together the difficult tasks, the heavy responsibilities, and the momentous decisions of their high office.

Be with the men of our armed forces, who by their courage, their loyalty, and their lives protect us on the land, in the air, and on the sea. Make us worthy, O God, of their sacrifice.

Hasten the day when oppression and tyranny shall be no more, when peace shall come and the cause of righteousness for which we stand shall be victorious. For we ask it in the spirit of the Christ who came to set men free. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday,

October 1, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### REPORT ON PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to the personnel of the land forces, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### THE POLL TAX—TELEGRAM FROM GOVERNOR OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, in order that my colleagues, and the country as well, may know the attitude of the people of Mississippi in regard to certain proposed legislation, I wish to read into the Record and have appropriately referred a telegram from the Governor of Mississippi. It is as follows:

JACKSON, MISS., October 1, 1942.

Senator THEODORE G. BILBO,  
Washington, D. C.:

As Governor of Mississippi and knowing that I speak the sentiment of the people of Mississippi on this subject, I urgently appeal to you to oppose the present attempt to do away with our poll tax requirement by congressional action. Congress has no constitutional authority to pass such an act. It appears that certain would-be reformers are taking advantage of the war conditions to put over their so-called reforms. This is a time for unity of our people. It is no time for measures which seek to divide us. We should all stand together. Measures like this and some others that are in the making by leaders who have themselves been misled tend to divide our country.

PAUL B. JOHNSON,  
Governor of Mississippi.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The telegram presented by the Senator from Mississippi will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### STATEMENT IN NATURE OF A PETITION FROM GEARY COUNTY, KANS., ON THE SCARCITY OF FARM LABOR

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the Record and appropriately referred a statement in the nature of a petition signed by representatives of the Geary County Farm Bureau Board, U. S. D. A., A. A. A. county committee, and representatives of the Geary County Bankers Association, regarding the scarcity of farm labor.

There being no objection, the statement in the nature of a petition was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JUNCTION CITY, KANS.,  
September 22, 1942.

We, the undersigned of the Geary County Farm Bureau Board, Agricultural War Board, County Agricultural Adjustment Agency Committee, and representatives of the County Bankers Association, because of the serious need of farm products for food and for necessities of war, and the extreme